DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 535 CG 004 990

AUTHOR	Berger, Marc I.; And Others
TITLE	Understanding Students and Counseling Two-year Colleges. Spring Workshops. Second Monograph.
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Albany. Two Year Coll. Student Development Center.
PUB DATE	Jun 69
NOTE	103p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.25
DESCRIPTORS	College Administration, College Bound Students, College Choice, College Curriculum, College Deans, College Environment, College Planning, College Programs, College Role, College Students, Community Colleges, Counseling Services, *Disadvantaged Youth, Junior Colleges, *Junior College Students, Post Secondary Education, Student Adjustment, Student College Relationship, *Student Needs, *Student Personnel Services, *Student Personnel Work, Student Personnel Workers, Students

ABSTRACT

These six papers concern general educational problems and problems specific to two year colleges. In the first, Dr. Marc Berger stated unequivocally that Education, as traditionally viewed, is mythology. Its potential for bringing about change in the social order is non-existent; the task is beyond its scope. Dr. William Birenbaum, in the second presentation, questioned a wide spectrum of personnel-student relationship problem areas. Hypocrisy on the part of college leadership has kept due process and integration of people, subject matter and programs off the American Campus. Deans of students, he concluded, by being part of this, are now obsolete. Next, Dr. Arnold Buckheimer emphasized the need for dialogue and confrontation if college personnel are to be what he thinks they must be, viz., change-agents who meet students' needs. Dorothy Knoell defined disadvantagement and specified program and curriculum developments which are aimed at reaching this group. In a related talk, Dr. Carolyn Sherif discussed her 10 year study of the behavior, attitudes, and goals of disadvantaged youths. Dr. Louis Lieberman, in the final paper, discussed the problems of socialization of the two-year college student and the ramifications should these be overlooked. (TL)

ED039535

UNDERSTANDING
STUDENTS AND COUNSELING
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Spring Workshops

CG004990
Conference Programs

SECOND MONOGRAPH

sponsored by

Two-Year College Student Development Center
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

ED0 39535

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UNDERSTANDING
STUDENTS AND COUNSELING
TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Spring Workshops

Albany, New York	March 6 - 8, 1969
Suffern, New York	March 13 - 15, 1969
New York, New York.........	March 20 - 22, 1969
Syracuse, New York	April 17 - 19, 1969
Batavia, New York	April 20 - 22, 1969

Second Monograph

June, 1969

Two-Year College Student Development Center
State University of New York at Albany

INDEX

Title	Author	Color Code
Education as Mythology	Marc Berger	White
Freedom For the Students	William Birenbaum	Blue
The Counselor as "Change-Agent"	Arnold Buckheimer	Yellow
Outreach to the Disadvantaged	Dorothy Knoell	Green
Problems in the Socialization of the Two-Year College Student	Louis Lieberman	Beige
Behavior, Attitudes and Goals of Disadvantaged Youth	Carolyn Sherif	Peach

PREFACE

The success of our Spring Workshops must be attributed to the women and men who are represented in part by the papers included in this monograph. The Workshops were a learning experience for the Two-Year College Student Development Center, as well as for those who attended from the two-year colleges. Many difficult issues were raised and never settled, as it should be in any moving and growing profession. The counseling role is so important in the education process, that those of us involved and concerned with it must keep its direction and focus opened and moving.

For those who attended the Workshops, we hope these papers will cause you to continue the discussions started and bring new perspectives to the critical job facing us. For those who did not attend the Workshops, we hope these papers may be a stimulus to you in joining the colloquy of our future and its existence. The importance of the student involvement in the Workshops is not treated in this monograph, but we must not overlook their participation in something which is only for them.

Our learning experience from the Workshops causes us to have hope and concern for the future. This concern shall be our strength and commitment to the future.

Arthur A. Hitchcock
Director

EDUCATION AS MYTHOLOGY

by

M. I. Berger
State University of New York at Albany

In 1932 George Counts delivered three speeches which were incorporated in a pamphlet entitled "Dare the School Build a New Social Order?" The statement has become a classic in the history of American educational thought for it is both a symbol of those hard times and the clear expression of an American ideology. "The time has come," said Counts, "for the schools to lead society." He continues, "that teachers should deliberately reach for power and then make the most of their conquest is my firm conviction. To the extent that they are permitted to fashion the curriculum and the procedures of the school they will definitely and positively influence the social attitudes, ideals, and behavior of the coming generation."[1] Counts believed that the source of a new social order would come from the teachers who, he said, "representing as they do, not the interests of the moment or of any special class, but rather the common and abiding interests of the people. . . are under heavy social obligation to protect and further those interests."[2] For Counts it is scarcely thinkable that these men and women would ever act as selfishly or bungle as badly as have the so-called "practical" men of our generation --- the politicians, the financiers, the industrialists.

This pamphlet, I said, is a classic expression of an American ideology or perhaps myth --- notably, that the public school is the clearest expression of American democracy and the surest agency for social change. That a progressive educator in 1932 would hold such a view is understandable in the light of the history of American ideas.

The public school has always been at the center of America's ideological structure. Conceived in the early days of the republic the public school became and remained the most concrete expression of the great American experiment. In the rhetoric of the early reformers, the common school was to initiate the young into the new liberating political life of democracy. And by the end of the nineteenth century the vision of the public school had been extended so that the school became the exemplification of the great American ideal of freedom of opportunity. Through the avenue of free public education all men became eligible for the good life. A free system of education reaching from the elementary school to the state university was material proof of the efficacy of the democratic experiment, of the reality of the American dream. And beyond that the Progressive tradition made the public schools the missionaries of even greater social and political reform. In 1897, John Dewey wrote in his "Pedagogic Creed":

> I believe that education is the fundamental method of social progress and reform.
> I believe that the community's duty to education is therefore, its paramount moral duty. By law and punishment, by social agitation and discussion, society can regulate and form itself into a more or less haphazard and chance way. But through education society can formulate its own purposes, can organize its own means and resources, and thus shape itself with definiteness and economy in the direction in which it wishes to move.
> I believe it is the business of everyone interested in education to insist upon the school as the primary and most effective interest of social progress and reform in order that society may be awakened to realize what the school stands for, and aroused to the necessity of endowing the educator with sufficient equipment to perform his task.[3]

There is a clear, direct line that moves from Dewey's statement in 1897 to Counts' statement thirty-five years later. In both men there is that faith that education can bring about a new, better, social order. And in the years after 1932 that irrepressible faith in education as an instrument of social change persisted. With the emergence of theories of social class and the influence of social class on learning, educational reform took a new turn but still conformed to the notion of the school as social reformer. Now it was argued that lower class children were at a disadvantage in the middle class school. And the solution --- the schools ought to teach lower class children the middle-class virtures, thereby enabling them to succeed scholastically and move up the social ladder. After 1930, and ever since, the training of teachers has been rooted in a blend of social class theory and Freudian romanticism. Within this new pedagogical ideology the teacher was more than a disseminator of knowledge. Now the teacher, through his imagination, his psychological insight, would bring the child - particularly the lower class child - to a brighter, happier, more promising future. Here were the intimations of the idea of compensatory education, an idea that would come to fruition in our own time. The teacher and the school would compensate for the social class deficiencies of the home. In this bright new theory of pedagogy the teacher - by example, by praise, by seeking to exploit the talents within the child - would lift the child out of his class lethargy into a higher level of being. For me this whole idea was epitomized in a film I had seen as a college student in an education course. As I dimly remember that absurd gem of pedagogical propaganda it was the story of a young girl in a junior high school, who, to sum up all her failings, was a mess. She came from a lower-class home (The father was a drunkard, the mother a breeder of children and the home a shack). The girl was white --- in those days the profession had not yet moved to that courageous postion of showing black children, even as examples of the lower class. She was pimply, self-conscious, disheveled, lethargic. But the teacher sensed the challenge --- the real challenge in Ada. My task, says the teacher to herself one evening as she sits grading papers in her classroom, is to bring her out. And bring her out she does, by that simplest but most potent of all educational forces---the bulletin board. The therapeutic technique is classic: teacher places the girl's drawings on the board, students notice work and praise her, girl gains self-confidence, becomes beautiful and interested in school work, moves up the social ladder, end of story. Perhaps the attrition rate in the teaching profession has been so high because too many young people have entered teaching with the idea that their main job was going to be to transform unhappy girls into campus queens in one semester.

Something has happened in the last few years to alter this view of the school as a dramatic force in social and political change. In this age of disenchantment the school as much as our other institutions has come under critical review. The black side of our social life and history is being revealed. Revisionist histories of education and the social realities of our own times have forced critical reassessment of the great American dream. Now historians are arguing that the common school from its very inception was at least covertly viewed by those who supported it, as much a conserving force as a liberating force---an institution created to guarantee that the existing social order would not be overthrown by revolutionary mobs. And what the schools offered later in the nineteenth century was not a path to an open society but rather a path which allowed a few to move into the upper economic and social world while most remained or were shunted into the lower services of an industrial age. If American society created emancipating free universities, then it must also be remembered that it created inhibiting industrial and vocational schools.

Some still argue that the genius of American education is its commitment to universal education and the popularization of culture. But in the new critical light, that genius is more rhetorical and mythical than real. If the expressions of Thomas Jefferson, Horace Mann, and Henry Barnard supplied the rhetoric for the public school ideal, it was the pressure of an increasingly efficient industrialized society which made the public school a necessity. An economic system which relied less and less on manpower for production necessarily needed an institution which would keep a large portion of the population of the labor market. And it is just this economic pressure which continues to be the animating spirit of American education. From the nursery school to the university, the American public school operates primarily as a "holding" institution. As such, the classic academic notions of learning and knowledge are obscured in the schools. And in this disenchanted view of our schools we don't see teachers who bring culture to the masses but teachers whose main job is keeping the kids quiet and busy.

What I am arguing is that our public schools have never been what they were ideally supposed to be. Our schools did not make us free, rather thay made only some of us free. And the granting of that freedom, of social mobility, was not a gratuitous gesture. If some were made free, economically and socially, it was because there was a need for some to have this freedom. (The upper classes could not supply all the lawyers, doctors and teachers needed in a burgeoning society---although they did manage to fill the demands for bankers and board members).

Social fictions and national myths do have a vital, life-giving function. They offer the hope of what may yet be. They provide us with a teleology. They are promises to be kept. They give unity to a disjointed world, but myths just as metaphors become diseased and die. If metaphors die through overuse, myths perish through abuse. When the discrepancy between the ideal and real becomes too great and when the discrepancy becomes too evident, the myth dies. A myth can be stretched only so far. Once, the public school ideal could serve its social function as myth. Once, the public schools could stand as fictional proof that America was the land of opportunity, that anyone who did not succeed had only himself to blame---but not anymore. The discrepancy between the myth and the reality has become too great and too self-evident. Disenchantment has set in. So great is that disenchantment that reformers and educators of underdeveloped countries are beginning to doubt that the American educational model is the best way to liberate a society. Monsignor Ivan Illich, a leading Latin American scholar recently wrote:

> During the . . . past twenty years both Latin American governments and foreign technical assistance agencies have come to rely increasingly on the capacity of grammar, trade, and high schools to lead the nonrural majority out of its marginality in shanty towns and subsistence farms, into the type of factory markets, and public forum which corresponds to modern technology. It was assumed that schooling would eventually produce a broad middle class with values resembling those of highly industrialized nations, despite the economy of continued scarcity.
> Accumulating evidence now indicates that schooling does not and cannot produce the expected results.
> . . . We must not exclude the possibility that the emerging nations cannot be schooled, that schooling is not a

> viable answer to their need for universal education. Perhaps this type of insight is needed to clear the way for a futuristic scenario in which schools as we know them today would disappear.

Finally, he says,

> . . . I submit that one of the reasons for the awakening frustration in the majorities is the progressive acceptance of the "liberal myth." the assumption that schooling is an assurance of social integration.

Ivan Illich's disillusionment with formal schooling parallels what has been happening in this country. The black people in America are also in a sense an underdeveloped nation. And the large mistake that has been made in this country was to suppose that education could bring about social and political restitution. The Supreme Court decision in 1954 was misread by many as meaning that black children must be made free through education. Rather the decision should have been understood as saying black children ought to be free and our schools are one example that they are not. And the evidence shows that since 1954 we have invested our largest effort toward bringing about racial justice through education. And even that effort has not amounted to much. The results of the attempted educational reforms have been disappointing---shockingly so. After examining the evidence many theoreticians now put forth the bitter claim that no educational program aimed at disadvantaged children has proven to be consistently successful over any significant period. Just as disturbing is the report entitled Equality of Educational Opportunity which was commissioned under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This Coleman report observed that the differences between good and bad schools does not seem to matter very much in improving a child's academic forces. Moreover, the gap between black and white children's academic achievement is largely if not entirely attributable to factors over which school boards have no control. The report stated that the most significant correlate of achievement test scores is the social-class climate of the school's student body. In a word children of all backgrounds tend to do better in schools with a predominant middle-class milieu. And even then the improvement has not been startling.

Again, one large mistake has been made by many politicians and educators---that the way to bring about change in children and society is through the schools, and exclusively the schools. My argument has been that schools have rarely initiated change, that what they do is support and protect the popular beliefs of their age and culture. Moreover there is increasing evidence to indicate that schools are not as powerful an agency of learning as we have made them out to be. J. M. Stephens argues in his book The Process of Schooling that children learn despite the forces of schooling rather than because of them. In the past thirty years of experimentation in the improvement of teaching using such variations in technique as team teaching, small classes, television, nongraded instruction, programmed instruction, the evidence indicates that none of these techniques had any effect on school achievement.

If any change is going to come about in the social, political, and economic status of a major segment of our population it will not be as a result of new educational techniques. It will only come about when the people who hold the political, economic and social power of this country support that change. No school system, no matter how enlightened or how reformist in zeal, can succeed in the face of social opposition. Education, at least education alone, will not free the black man. Only a total reconstruction of society will do that. The best educators have realized that. They have come to see that as educators they must become political. A hungry child cannot learn; therefore, hunger must be eliminated. A child who has no confidence that in some way he shares in the control of his environment will have little motivation to learn. Therefore his people ought to be allowed to control the school he attends. What I am saying is that social class theory about the distinctive culture of the poor is another myth as Charles A. Valentine says in Culture and Poverty. The difference between the poor and the middle-class is that the poor have less money. You make poor people middle-class not by putting them in middle-class schools but by giving them the things middle-class people have.

George Counts raised the question, "Dare the schools build a new social odder?" thirty-five years ago. The question in our time is dare society build a new educational order? The schools today are the targets of a new, critical social vision. If that and the criticism as I described it are correct, two things follow. Given the limits of usefulness and modifiability of our schools, we ought to begin to establish and support other institutions and life forms which educate people. I mean everything from work-study programs to families. Secondly, if our schools have not been doing what we thought they were doing or what they purported to be doing, then the structure and curriculum of our formal systems of education ought to be reexamined, and, if necessary, changed. This, I think is exactly what's beginning to happen in universities throughout America today.

In my own defense let me finally say that my polemical argument was not intended as an unequivocal denunciation of American education or American society. I agree with Churchill that democracy is the worst political system excepting all the others. What I have tried to say is that there are some myths about America and its educational system that have outlived their usefulness. I say we have exaggerated the social, economic, and political force of formal education in America. I say this not because I am opposed to schools but just because I delight in them. Formal education represents that one privileged place in society where the young and the old can freely examine knowledge. Nothing more ought to be asked of our school---save perhaps that this activity not be deadly. It's when we do make the other burdensome demands of citizenship, morality, and equality of opportunity that the schools fall short. But the schools fail in reordering men and society not because they are inept, but because the task is beyond them. It is because we do unjustly impose these demands on our schools that they ultimately become society's scapegoat---dope addiction, moral corruption, violence, all are the fault of our schools.

Institutions like men each have their own thing to do. Schools are a place where men devote time and energy to knowledge and understanding. Let the new social order begin with that modest admission.

FOOTNOTES

1 Counts, George S., Dare the School Build a New Social Order? New York, The John Day Company, 1928, p. 28.

2 Ibid., p. 29.

3 Dewey, John, My Pedagogic Creed, published originally as a pamphlet by E. L. Kellogg and Co., 1897. Included in the selected writings of John Dewey, edited by Reginald O. Archambault, John Dewey on Education, New York, The Modern Library, 1964, pp. 437-438.

4 Illich, Ivan, "The Futility of Schooling in Latin America," Saturday Review, April 20, 1968, p. 57.

5 Stephens, J. M., The Process of Schooling, New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

6 Valentine, Charles A., Culture and Poverty, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1968.

PRESENTATION*

by

Dr. William Birenbaum
President of Staten Island Community College

George Bernard Shaw once sent to Sir Winston Churchill a note which read: Dear Winnie: I have a new show opening in London next week. Enclosed are two tickets for opening night. I'd be delighted if you'd come and bring a friend if you have one. Sir Winston replied: Dear Bernie: I'd love to come on opening night but I can't. I'll be happy to come the second night if there is one. Well, when you are in my position you sometimes wonder who your friends are and when you leave the campus to come to a conference to make some inane remarks you wonder whether there's a second night at the place when you get back.

I'm deeply puzzled by the present state of affairs. For example the emphasis on academic programs at the collegiate level that are directed toward what is called the culturally disadvantaged or deprived. These programs are cropping up all over the place and at least on a campus like mine it becomes clear that the definition of what the group is that is culturally deprived or disadvantaged becomes more and more ambiguous. I guess it started out with the intention of being racial but as it is being elaborated, more and more colors and ethnic backgrounds seem to get involved. In fact, I have been speaking lately with student leadership who have been trying to persuade me that substantial elements of my faculty are culturally disadvantaged. And I must say that the evidence they present regarding this is in part quite persuasive. Of course, once one uses a word like "disadvantaged" or "deprived", one implies a value system. You understand what to be disadvantaged or deprived is. It means that one must be able to state positively a standard against which one measures disadvantagment or deprivation. One thing is clear, the existence at the college level of programs so categorized is very, very clear if not conclusive evidence of the prior failure of secondary and elementary educational systems. What is not yet frankly admitted by those in charge of the college system is that the quality of the programs so described and indeed the existence of them in the college curriculum is fairly conclusive evidence of the failure of that educational system too. There is an emphasis in these programs upon skills. The skills most commonly involved have to do with the mastery of the language of the land and numbers systems upon which almost everything else these days have come to depend. There is a signal lack of emphasis in these programs upon the deprivation of students who might be involved in them with regard to freedom education. It apparently is assumed that American youth at the college threshold age, whom we are receiving, do possess the freedom skills, or it is assumed that there are no skills involved. Collegiate leadership is very ambivilant about all this. Because freedom is, after all, a political concept. Academics and professional colleagues in the administration of colleges and universities for reasons of their own make a fetish of proving that they are above and beyond politics. That they are apolitical. I am convinced that this posture is a part of their weaponry system to defend the present political rigging whose privileges they enjoy and in which they have a vested interest. With regard to freedom education, our puzzlement begins with an inability to be clear about the kind of humans with whom we are dealing. Are our young people between the ages of 18 and 21 adults or aren't they? If they are adults obviously they are younger adults. If they are not adults, what are they? On the typical university campus in this country the mean age in the student boy is between 21 and 22. On the typical four year college campus the mean age of the student body is between 20 and 21. On the typical two-year campus the mean age of the kinds of student bodies we are now getting hovers around 20. What are the expectations of American society regarding people in these age categories? The legal age of marriage without consent for a female is 18 in most state jurisdictions. Automobiles can be driven under the authority of the state at the age of 16 in most jurisdictions. Liquor can be purchased in many at the age of 18 and in almost all at 21. People can vote at the age of 21 in this country and there is a growing pressure to reduce that voting age to 18. Young men can be drafted to go to Viet Nam to defend older men like me at the age of 19 and many are drafted at the age of 19. In Bedford-Stuyvesant the reality of adult life, I am convinced from my own experience there, has a meaning for human beings around the age of 11 or 12. At that point, where peer group authority takes over and where the best form for the expression of freedom becomes the street, a familiarity with pot, with sex, with what it takes to survive in these kinds of communities, and a very practical working knowledge of political life in America, is learned by people at age 11, 12, 13 or 14. In Bedford-Stuyvesant where 30% of the youth of high school graduating age graduate, and where that 30% - 17% graduating with high school diplomas that create a presumption of college admissibility and where 1% of the college admission age in fact enter college. In a community like this the decision to drop out of high school we found, was generally made between the ages of 11 and 13, and consummated generally at the beginning age of 14 and reaching a peak at the age of 15 and beginning to curve down at the age of 16. Now, we're not sure, with the systems to which we receive these kinds of people, what we think we are receiving. Consequently, our bulletins, our speeches, our official pronouncements about what we are doing, talk about academic communities in a free society with the purposes of equipping people to survive in this economy and emerge with the political moxie required to perform the responsibilities of a free citizen and also be liberally educated. This is what we say. We received them, however, in academic communities, which are less and less skillfully, in my opinion, preparing people for economic survival in this society, which virtually ignore the disciplines required for the survival of free men in this political state, and which particularly at the two-year college level, but increasingly apparently in the senior colleges, are not producing liberally educated men. Indeed, what we are doing raises questions about who among those who are responsible for teaching is liberally educated. How many college presidents represent the ideal of the Renaissance man? How many Deans of Students are liberally educated? How many of the professional academic snobs in the traditional academic departments who look down their noses at Student Personnel people are themselves consummate examples of liberally educated men? The weaponry of student personnel systems in our higher educational institutions, the weaponry available to be addressed to the issues, is under the impact of contemporary circumstances as I read them, a highly inadequate weaponry system. Traditional counseling based upon psychological premises may have some theraputic effect upon the problems of individuals. I say "may" and I make that statement assuming that it is appropriate for the academic institution to engage in the therapeutic function at this level in the first place and underscore that this is an assumption. But even if it does have some therapeutic benefit to individuals, it does not, and by its nature, cannot, effectively be addressed to the problems of the community. And if it does spill over into the political realm, if the giving of the psychiatric and psychological counseling does get involved in taking a position on the political issues, the scientific content which is the pretense upon which giving this service is justified, is seriously compromised, then you are left with questions like: What is it towards which the adjustment is aimed? And once you ask that question, all of the key political issues immediately surface and lead to additional questions about the competence and the authority of the counselor to assert whatever value system he tries to assert through the professional service he renders. In those cases where academic counseling is involved, we have to keep in mind that the counseling is completely restricted by the prevailing academic system which it is supposed to service. All that the academic counselor is doing, if he is doing anything, I guess, is trying to lead the client through the maze. Illogical, irrational, and often without destination, the maze which is set in motion by the current curricula in our colleges. Areas of very low status traditionally in the Student Personnel field, like financial aid, because they have traditionally been low status, have not attracted the kind of personnel who can come to grips with, now, the vital economic, political and social issues which naturally gravitate into the offices of this sector of the system. As for Student Government, it's a sham. It has nothing to do with government. Unfortunately, Deans of Students frequently are the last to come to grips with that reality but again increasingly, the students who count seem to understand this reality. Consequently, when the agitators, the activists, the militant ones, black, white, and all other variations of color, confront this part of the establishment with the kinds of issues that are now arising, the establishment immediately finds itself on the defensive and if it is to perform well at all, can point only to modest victories from time to time in cooling things. And, of course, the concept of cooling things under the present circumstances is a very subversive concept. It is a time when the prime educational responsibility, it seems to me, of everyone involved, presidents, faculty, and other administrative staff, is not to keep things cool but to heat them up further and to equip those who will not accept the status quo with the essential political and economic skills for coming to grips with the status quo. The saddest thing about the American student movement now is not the critique which it represents; the critique like Paul Goodman's critique, is valid, inciteful and powerful. The sad thing about the American Student Movement now is the complete incapacity of the students to understand the realities of the kind of tactics required to effect change. And thus, like Paul Goodman, having made a critique, no positive course of action pursues the critical conclusions reached. Those in charge who stand up in public now and deplore the breakdown of campus law and order and say very little more, are not telling the truth. They are not telling the truth that the youth who represent the breakdown have had no prior education in the tactics of freedom. They are not telling the truth that those in charge are in charge of wobbly, creaking, shaggard educational systems that no longer work well. They are not telling the truth that those in charge really are not moved for a passion for reform but are primarily moved by the desire to shore up their own power situations. The essence of law, of course, is justice. The Father Hessbergs of this epic are talking about the abuse of due process on our campuses, Black separatism and further segregation and how un-American these things are. Bruno Betterholm is in this mornings Times comparing the present state of unrest on our campuses with pre-Hitler German university conditions. Sidney Hook is deploring the politicalization of the American academic scene. Who are they kidding? What is the due process that we bring young American adults into and expose them to on our campuses? Talk about segregation! We segregate undergraduate from graduate in professional knowledge. We segregate with status and prestige consequences two-year campuses from four. Within the two-year situations we segregate the low grade, career vocationally orientated subject matter from the high grade, high status, so called liberal arts.............................We segregate those who teach from those who are taught by every device we can. By rank, title, reward, and even the labels we put on bathrooms -- Staff Only. By the admission threshold procedures that we now follow, the devices that we seem to revere that identify and honor talent, we are also segregating people as they come into this segregated community which we champion. By social class, by cultural background and eventually by race. In my opinion, those who are now concerned about breakdown of law and order on our campuses and are waving their banners with the slogans on them "Due Process" and "Integration" are acting as if due process and integration exist in American higher education and therefore can be defended. That's a lie. There is no real due process in American higher education and there is no integration and never has been on the American campus, at any level, regarding people, subject matter, or programs. And personally, I cannot hold culpable young American adults who listen to the propaganda of free enterprise, individuality, self discipline, freedom, equality, who come to these campuses and out of a kind of native intelligence born of experience, see through the hypocrisy on the one hand but because of prior processing systems in the educational establishments, in their churches, in their families, and in their communities, arrive at the ripe old age of 18 without any capacity whatsoever to regulate a free community. So my thesis simply stated is, that Deans of Students are what they represent, Student Personnel parts of the administration of our campuses and what they have come to be, are revealed, I think, by the present series of events, basically to be obsolete. And in light of who stands for leadership in higher education in a era when the relationship with the clientele, the students, is the primary issue, in light of the fact that no great leadership has emerged from the Student Personnel field which any of us can really name, I think that there is very substantial evidence, at least enough to engage in the statement successfully with, supportive of the conclusion, that Deans of Students, by title, are a part of the hypocrisy and that the services, the quality of it, the thrust of it, the weaponry systems upon which it is based, the services themselves have become increasingly obsolete. And as I see it, that's your problem.

---

*Transcribed from recorded tapes by the Two-Year College Student Development Center

Now we can have a discussion if you wish.

Q/C: When you talk about Deans of Students being obsolete and part of that hypocrisy, are you referring to the role of the Dean of Students as only part of the administration? How about his other roles as representative of the students, chairman of the department of Student Personnel, a member of the faculty? Doesn't he have many roles and aren't you just talking about the one administrative role?

DR. BIRENBAUM: No, I meant to talk about the composite meaning of them all. He is a member of the faculty generally as a matter of courtesy. He is not a representative of the students. He is a representative of the administrative staff and the establishment behind him and as a professional man he represents whatever his claim to professional fame is. In psych, the school of hard knocks, or whatever path he traveled to get that label stamped on him. It would be more accurate to call some of them Deans for Students because some of them, through the milk of human kindness, they have come to contain, some of them through an abundance of good intentions which good people sometimes make manifest, do in fact either think they are acting for students and, in fact, may occasionally act for students but the preposition in this title, and you know, if students know it, what can you do about it? That "of" should be stricken. He is more like a Commissar in the Soviet Society than he is a representative of a free people sustained by a constituency. Everybody knows it except a lot of Deans of Students.

Q/C: Why stop with Dean of Students?

DR. BIRENBAUM: I'm talking about Deans of Students this morning because I was told when I was asked yesterday to come here that this had something to do with Student Personnel. If you want me to give you a lecture about the rest of the establishment we can get into that.

Q/C: I think it ties in with the rest of the establishment.

DR. BIRENBAUM: Including the President.

Q/C: Right.

DR. BIRENBAUM: Especially the president. I agree. I agree.

Q/C: I have a two part question, Dr. Birenbaum. First of all, you alluded to the Renaissance man and to the liberally educated man. From your experience and from what you have said, how would you describe what the Student Personnel worker should be? Secondly, every concerned educator, sometime in their life, has an ideal, now what I am concerned with, what is your ideal system on the two-year college level? What would you like to see become the system?

DR. BIRENBAUM: Let me respond to this two-prone question with two simple sentences and then my elaboration. The Student Personnel worker should, in my opinion, conceive himself as a liberator of fellow human beings and in a Revolutionary time his image should be that of Che Geuvara or somebody like that, in my opinion. Secondly, as to the ideal system. The ideal system, if we are talking about the United States of America, should be a system which in its every part has as its primary educational goal the liberation of humans. Now, I will elaborate on that a bit. The question of liberation, which is what I have always thought education was to be about, is imtimately connected to the question of motivation. How can you bring these black kids into these communities and say to them, "Opportunity - grab it", when you are not willing to match that statement with the practical, realistic instruments and tools for grabbing. How are you to motivate people to want to be powerful if you do not arm those people with the laboratory conditions for power. Now it seems to me so elementary but what is, in fact, the case, is double talk. What in fact the case is, is double talk particularly in the areas with which you are concerned at least in the sciences. Even with freshmen in two-year colleges in career programs they aren't on campus very long before there is some escape from the 30 to 50 seat classroom into the laboratory. At some point they confront on my campus these monstrous electrical machines and other devices soon .... I have walked in after the fourth or fifth weeks of school and see them getting their hands dirty with cadavers of animals. But when I walk into my political science classes all I hear is a man up front dishing out what any normal human being of twelfth grade level can read for himself out of a textbook or espousing his own views and interpretations of that material while simultaneously I can walk across the quadrangle into the area of the school where the students are doing their so-called extra curricular thing and see students who can't even tell me the basic political distinctions between the legislative, judicial and executive branch of government. I find counselors on my own staff who think that the biggest problems my students face is their ignorance about the "Roberts Rules of Order". I meet people around the place who are drawing great salaries who still think that America can get out of her plight by exposing people to the technics of group dynamics on a weekend. Now, let me tell you something. As I read it, there is not time. As I read it, that weaponry system is obsolete. Now I may be wrong but the typical university and college campus in this city and across this country is not a free community, is not an integrated community and is not a community in which there are fair ground-rules for the citizens. They are more like consummate welfare states, socialistic in their basic idealogical core, led by men who in order to survive politically in America must talk about freedom, equality, the propriety of individuals possessing power for self-realization so that you have this horrible result of socialist states being led by people talking the language of freedom, creating a highly visible hypocrisy which anyone in his right mind can see through and with a constituency seeing through it having been processed at lower levels and still being processed by this system adopting tactics which fail, which is the saddest part of all and you know, the liberating influence that this dimension of the profession should be advocating, representing, manifesting, to every resource it can mobilize, is to equip these citizens with the tools of freedom so they can be effective.

Q/C: I would like to take issue with you on your general position because while admitting to your critique of the establishment, I find that most of the people who are the instigators represent the worst establishment. In other words, I find that these people, as I talk with them in my classes of political science are fanatics. Many of them will be intolerant of freedom, and will use power for their own advantage.

DR. BIRENBAUM: Well, as you say, we just disagree. About fanaticism, I think history, to the extent that history ever proves anything, shows some relationship between the fanatical character of a broad population and the extent to which that population comes to feel popularly oppressed. Under the present circumstances, therefore, as I view the establishment to which you and I are a part, there is every need for fanaticism; every justification for encouraging it. Indeed, the real problem is that nobody really cares. We are not talking about the broad masses of our students, because they can be lead around by the nose anywhere we want to lead them. I can lead them onto the Veranzano Bridge and ask them to jump off and if they get three credit hours for it they'll probably do it. So, the fact that if you empower people they may use it in the pursuit of self interest, doesn't frighten me. In fact, as a president who meets every day his faculty and students and fellow administrators in the privacy of his office almost everything they say to me is an argument in pursuit of their self-interest, and an effort to pursuade me to use my power to further empower them to pursue their own self interests. If you empower the clientele we are talking about, "They may end up being intolerant of freedom;" I think that's the most debatable point in the difference between us. I don't think any of us can judge that until free men are before us to judge. We are speculating about how people will act when they are in college. You know, it is like the other fight I am now engaged on on my campus this week. When I came to Staten Island the faculty search committee for a president went through their things with me, their interviews deciding whether or not to hire me. The one thing they told me over and over again was that

Staten Island Community College had a rich, twelve-year history of consummate faculty democracy and they wanted to know if I would be the kind of president who would respect that. Well, you know, that's a real funny question. If a guy wants a job, what does he say? I'm for faculty democracy and what they needed was reassurance. I had to say it several times to reassure them that I'm for faculty democracy. So I came there, you know, all excited about being president of the place where I had a faculty that really was democratic and eager to continue to be. Well, I found out two things the first week, both of which shocked me. The young people coming out of grad school--some of them are radical. Some of them are activists. Look how they acted at the Modern Language Association thing and blah, blah, etc. When the head of my Afro-American Club came in several weeks ago and said: "Look, I want a vote on curriculum committee after what's happened in history with black history. I don't want to just talk about it any more. I want to be there. I want to vote." I said, "Christopher, look, we've got problems. I can't respond to requests for student power until I get some measure of power for two-thirds of the people who teach full time here. So regarding the faculty mostly under thirty without vote and you guys mostly under twenty-two without vote, you have a common political interest and if you want to make a treaty here, understanding what we are after--fine, we can work together. But in my opinion you are wasting your time yapping at me about student power until I solve this other problem. If you think I am going to put students on curriculum committee with a vote when two-thirds of the people who teach around here full time aren't on it with a vote, you're crazy." Well, I am not a leader, and this man understands a lot of things and understood this one. It's like the black history thing; a department with a faculty of over thirty-five led by a man who on the day after Martin Luther King's death, gives a passionate speech about how, this is April of 1968, at this late date we are going to introduce black subject matter, in the form of our first black history course, then goes out and recruits and comes in with a candidate named Myron Feldstein who is still working on his Ph D. The departmental appointments committee naturally is all white, like the whole department is all white. The black kids go up in smoke. Only a black man can teach black history. For the first time that I am aware of in that department, the chairman and a few of his senior colleagues were asked to defend the concept that history is a science. Now I want to tell you something. The kids, these stupid kids, one of them a graduate of the Harlem Street Academy with a high school drop out record, these stupid kids, out-argued him. They got the chairman in the presence of a lot of people to admit history is more like an art than like a science. And with this great conclusion enunciated by the authority on the subject, the black kids moved in. "Well, if its like an art then the human factors enters in and you interpret things, and value systems get in, and as far as I am concerned, black is the biggest thing bearing upon my value system; therefore, black is relevant to teaching history. Only a black man can teach history." That's very shrewd reasoning. The whole college P & G committee, the upper level that had to approve what the whole departmental thing produced is exclusively white. Talk about fair play and due process! A complete white decision-making mechanism from the lowest guy in the department to the president. Anyway, as this issue developed, Christopher came in and said, "Dr. Birenbaum, I'm going to go out there in public and argue only a black man can teach black history, what are you going to do? Are you going to support us or not?" I had to say to him, "Now, Christopher, look, I'm president, I represent all the people; the Italians, the Irish, the Blacks, the Jews, the whole works and the last thing I'm going to do is go out there and argue that only a black man can teach black history. You know what I'm going to argue? It's like the New York school decentralization issue. You have people yapping due process and integration, I'm going to use their concepts. That's what my chairman used, those were his battle slogans. Due process and integration, history is a scholarly subject matter without color. You know, there is no color in history. Scholarship is without color. I'm going to argue that. I'm going to raise questions as president about due process. Was the process through which this thing was developed and staffed due? He is saying you've got to have an integrated college here. I'm going to raise questions about integration. Is an all white decision-making process in this situation integrated?" Christopher said, "You know, that's great. We can work together great. I'll go out and yell for due process and integration. Let's just not stumble over each other." The answer to your question is that the students finally compelled the department which had argued that students shouldn't even be consulted by the by-laws of City University, and they don't have to be about either curriculum or personnel. You know, it was a big breakthrough when the departmental representatives agreed to sit in a room with the students to hear what they wanted to say. That was a big deal. What finally happened was that the department agreed to give the Afro-American Society and the black faculty members of the college in other departments one week to show that the department agreed to give the Afro-American Society and the black faculty members of the college in other departments one week to show that the department had not adequately made a recruitment effort. In one week they had five sets of credentials which they presented to the department which just fortuitiously all happened to be of black scholars and these credentials in every case were, finally, in the judgment of the five white men on the departmental committee, two or in three cases superior to the credentials of the man they had initially recommended. Consequently, one of these, the best of them in their judgment, was picked. All I am saying is that we can't double talk, that's where the trouble originates.

Q/C: What are you doing to equip these young members of the faculty to learn how to use power to gain the kind of status that you feel they deserve and we agree they deserve?

DR. BIRENBAUM: Well, there are several things in the works and I can't honestly say that I have achieved anything yet. I am not sure I will. There is an out and out political campaign to enfranchise the two-third's, and this is now public and the gauntlet is down at all levels with my own college board, committee, with my senior faculty, with my sixteen colleague presidents most of whom don't want it yet and with the board itself and this will be pursued to a conclusion. I will not accept defeat on this issue short of a Board of Higher Education resolution. Now the Board of Higher Education wants to go on record, finally, as saying that that two-thirds should not possess the vote. Fine!, and if the faculty throughout City University wants to accept that conclusion, that's also fine, then everybody knows the handwriting is on the wall and you take the consequences and , I think there will be some real ones. Secondly, I have restructured the president's office, and have created an instrumentality for the diffusion of my decision-making powers and in this instrumentally, I have put, I think, largely new people in the key positions. My new people are the young faculty, or faculty that was not in a power position before, plus students. Each of the instruments has as its chairman a faculty member and as a vice chairman a student, and they possess relatively equal powers regarding the subject. The third thing which I am just at the threshold of is this: I am finding out that, except for a few senior faculty people on that campus and a smart president, and I think my predecessor was smart, a very few people understood the real flow of power on the campus. Few people understand where the decisions are really made. What the basic reference points of decision making are. How it works. Very, very few. I am now embarrassed because I have a small cadre of student leadership that emerged this year that has come to master the essentials of this system. Consequently, they're running around somewhat better informed than the vast majority of the faculty. Now the senior faculty are on P & G, and that controls the departmental decision-making mechanism. They have an idea of what the score is and how it works. I am now making efforts for an informal seminar which I am going to conduct and have begun to conduct, to inform the young un-tenured faculty about power distribution systems and the faults in the process of decision making. They don't know, and consequently, are running around shouting platitudes without knowing what they are talking about and they must know the facts about which they are talking. Now, of course, one of the consequences of succeeding will be that larger numbers of students will hear from them the truth. And pretty soon I will face a campus, I hope, in which a very substantial number of citizens understands how it works. Once that happens the campus will be in the kind of trouble that I am trying to put it in and this is my problem; to get it in that trouble quickly enough, because if you really take the kind of position I'm in seriously, you are, and if you have any sense at all, you know what is going on. You know you are in a foot race against time. On the one side is the vast majority characterized by two qualities, in my opinion. Passivity and disinterest on the one hand, and the maintenance of the present power system, the status quo, because they have so much privilege flowing from it and so much self-interest vested in it, an overwhelming majority on the other side. A growing activist group with revolutionary declarations on the tip of its tongue, ill-equipped to know what to do and how to make things work saying to men like me after they read my book, as I said in the preface to the book, "You know, you've been a part of the system too long not to be corrupted." But even if you aren"t corrupted, and none of them believe that you're not, they all believe that you are. Of course, they are probably right but even if you are not corrupted under present circumstances you can't deliver. Guys like you who are preaching reform and education, liberation, can't deliver and so people like myself are in the middle and the time is against us and we have a double barrelled problem of the most difficult kind. One, we are moral and not really corrupted, it's awfully difficult; and secondly, to show that you can deliver.

Q/C: I think your last statement is perhaps the most profound that you have made today; that presidents who want to shake things up and feel secure in that the world will not be lost or the college lost if we do, and this pertains both to students as well as to members of the faculty.

Q/C: Yesterday somebody at the meeting came up to me and asked me how they should get hold of counselors and make them good, and what I questioned was the criteria for determining who was a good counselor? Academics.......we have to look at this sort of thing. This a hypocrisy!

DR. BIRENBAUM: Well, what you are really commenting on is the so-called merit system. And as it turns out, this system in its full maturity, in its trade union form, the consummate form which it now takes, turns out to be further and further removed from the relevant reference points of merit. This is what you are saying. You know, it is another example of the double talk, about due process, and we're to defend it as if it existed, but everybody knows it doesn't. You don't want to upset the apple cart because of your respect for the merit system. That system is no longer really honoring most what is merit, given the problems we now face. And in a city like New York this is particularly ludicrous. Intelligent people know that there are more Ph D's in the field of economics doing pure research in the five boroughs of New York from non-academic bases south of Houston Street, the southern border of Greenwich Village to the Battery, than there are in all the universities in the City. Everybody knows this. Everybody knows that there isn't a decent university theater in New York City because the real talent in this art form doesn't need the academic base. It isn't like Ann Arbor or Bloomington, Indiana. Everybody knows that in our district in the performing and visual arts, the real talent in our city is non-academic. The only reason a creative writer will take a professorship is to have an income to put the time so he can do his thing off-campus and what he does on campus is an abomination and everybody knows it. Well, under these circumstances, you see, I choose neutral fields, like art and economics and the sciences and tell you about Standard Oils configurations in chemistry, everybody knows this in these fields when it comes to the so-called disadvantaged, when it comes to communities like Bedford-Stuyvesant and Harlem. If you are white and middle class and have had the benefits of the kind of education that I have had, in the normal course of integrated American life these days, you can live in New York a lifetime and never have stepped on a street in Bed-Stuy or Harlem let alone mastering that language for conversation. Now, the men making the judgments about merit, what qualifies, what does not, are the ones who are most ignorant of the situations about which their decisions are concerned. And this leads to a prostitution of the concept of merit. And to a further protraction of the kind of double talk that's gotten us into this horrible mess. I am reminded of when I was in Bed-Stuy, the Chairman of my Board, of my corporation there, is chairman of one of the great national mass media corporations. His office is a well-known name, you would know it the moment I told it to you. He is a well-known figure and he also happens to be chairman of the executive committee of the board of trustees of Columbia University and was simultaneously chairman of my board. His office is on the 35th floor of a skyscraper tower on Sixth Avenue in the Fifties, but I would get in the car and go on in to Bed-Stuy to a store front in the mornings for a meeting with the people, and these were the people who invited me there after the L.I.U. In essence they'd say, "Dr. Birenbaum, (now it's Mister), courageous fighter at L.I.U., we'll see how courageous you are here. Great authority on higher education, you don't know nothing." And they'd kill me. I'd get in my car and ride into Manhattan for lunch and go up into my chairman of the board's suite and you know what he would say to me? "Dr. Birenbaum, welcome, what's new in higher education today?" And I'd mouth a few profound platitudes and he's say, "That's very interesting"........and call it merit.

Q/C: I think that we're getting into a defensive battle here. About fanaticism. We are just as fanatic in protecting our own positions on the campus. I'm not quite thirty perhaps for this meeting. With my students I'm way over thirty. I think we're getting nowhere in this kind of meeting. I go to church and can say "Amen" to what the preacher says. We don't get down to the fundamentals of working and that is what the students are continually telling us. We don't begin to start solving their problems. I thought that by saying something at this point we may get another direction for the rest of the conference.

DR. BIRENBAUM: On this point, let me just make a comment. One thing, it would be interesting to see what would happen if people in your profession, in the institutions that can figure in giant systems like SUNY were to issue your proclamation; if you could agree among yourselves upon your liberating function. If you could delineate even modestly, tentatively, preliminarily, to the boards to which you are responsible, the present incapacities to perform what you know ought to be performed and demand revision of the system. It would be interesting to see the response you get.

Q/C: Doctor, I've had an uncomfortable feeling since I got here last night. I get the feeling that I am participating in a mass catharsis. That we are going to sit around here for two days and we're going to take all the guilt that we have from the craft that we are doing each day in this obsolete school system and that we're going to come in here and feel very comfortable because we have talked out the problem.

DR. BIRENBAUM: Did you talk them out last night?

Q/C: Not really.

DR. BIRENBAUM: Did you in your first session this morning?

Q/C: Not really. I have the uncomfortalbe feeling that we are going to sit around here, and, you know, get rid of guilt.

Q/C: Again, every system, in my opinion, has some weaknesses. From what you have stated so profoundly, it appears as if yours is the ideal one, one with no drawbacks.

DR. BIRENBAUM: You want to know about the drawbacks, talk with the man sitting next to you. Talk with him about the nitty gritty of a president who thinks the way I do and then try to do something, and you'll see how difficult life can be.

Q/C: If I may pursue my question, which is, with everyone pursuing their own self-interests, don't you feel that this would bring us to a rather chaotic state when we cannot come up with a unified scheme for direction when we still have difficulty coming up with unified efforts between students, faculty and administration? I guess what I am asking partially is what about values of people for people, for the country, for the nation?

DR. BIRENBAUM: Let's just stop right there for a moment. Are you puzzled about the values which the black students on your campus are trying to articulate? Do you understand them? Are you puzzled about the values for which your tenured faculty stands? Do they puzzle you? Your own president, do you know for what he stands? Is that a puzzlement to you? The by-laws of your system, they don't read a value structure to you? Maybe they don't. And if they don't that's the first part of your own education, but from my point of view, from my state of education regarding those four things, it is reasonably clear to me what the contending values are. So that's not the problem and neither is the problem anarchy. It is not fair to characterize what I have been trying to stand for this morning as the advocacy of an anarchical system. Quite the opposite. I have stood for the most rigorous athletic type of discipline which I think is at the core of any freedom system. It's like training for karate. The freedom of the motion that you get at the end depends very much upon rigorous up-tight practice. I'm not standing for anarchy. I'm raising the question about who shall possess the power to pursue certain values within an organized structure. The alternative, as I see it, is not chaos, through the pursuit of self-interest by individuals. I am raising the question about the interests which are honored by those individuals who are now disproportionately in power, and that's a very different matter. That's why I fall off the wagon we call Goodman. I was on the speaking circuit with him on some campuses a year and a half ago, and I saw what kids were asking. They flocked, the bare footed ones, the long haired ones, flocked to him as they still do and they say, "Mr. Goodman, this critique is it. You're with it, what do we do?" The Goodman position gets you in a little bit of trouble because what he proposes to do, is just not practical. What's practical is to make people free under these conditions.

PRESENTATION*

by

Dr. Arnold Buckheimer
City University of New York
Graduate Center, New York, New York

The day of the non-directive client centers one-to-one relationship in an institution is over. I think we have to recognize this as a primary function of a counselor. This doesn't in any way deny the validity of the training and client centered-ness as self-concept and all the other buzz-words that you've been subjected to in your recent or not so recent college training. It's my training, too. And I think it is quite possible to be very, very client centered and at the same time interventionists. Let me illustrate what I mean.

The kinds of perception, self-perception, that we saw last night in the movies, can be translated very easily, very completely and very totally in self-concept terms. Now it seems to me that the one-to-one relationship as we were told, and I think quite correctly, has no place in change here. Here, in order to change self-perception, social change has to be effective. The data that we know and understand has to be implemented and instrumented into the larger social context. And I think in this respect, being the advocate of the person, being the advocate of the individual, being the advocate of the kind of concerns that young people have, are crucial. And what are they? What are the concerns that were brought out? Who are the major enemies? Drugs, the police and the landlord. As organizations, as people, as individuals, as members of institutions...we're going to have to do some very, very basic things in social action terms to come to grips with the enemy as percieved by the kids as you saw last night. And then, fourthly, the schools--but I'll talk about that later.

---

*Transcribed from recorded tapes by the Two-Year College Student Development Center.

Counselors today in most any institution from high school through college through graduate institutions are going to have to be mobile people. They cannot sit in their offices and expect the clientele to come to them. The cafeteria table is as much of an encounter situation, and has as much possibility as the office does. And the President's office, in terms of data input to the President, to the administration, is just as much of a necessary encounter situation as the one-to-one situation, and we have to assume these kinds of responsibility. We have to let faculty and administration know that most of the milieu that a school as institution produces and perpetuates is in fact irrelevant.

Now whether you like Paul Goodman, or whether you don't like Paul Goodman, he's eloquent on that subject. I think we could very well heed him on the irrelevance of the total schooling process. I'm calling it the 'schooling process' and not the 'educational process', because regardless of whether you're middle-class, or whether you're lower class, or whether you're upper class, education today goes on outside of the institution, not inside of the institution, in terms of self-development, providing relevant experiences, and the arbitrary learning situation is a thing of the past, in terms of the kinds of needs young people express.

Now I think it was kind of interesting how the helping institution in one of last night's films was portrayed. It was portrayed as a sterile relationship that acceptance as we practice it, and as we display it, was, in fact, judgment, and that the pay-off did not occur in the service given but in the remuneration that was received. And when you think about your tenure rights, and your tenure problems, remember the face of the social worker in that film last night when he was kissing his piggy-bank. Look at your own piggy-bank, and look at your reward system and really do some self-searching.

As a client-centered individual, professor, professing client-centeredness, I believe in confrontation. I think confrontation is a one-to-one situation, confrontation is the institutional situation, in the social situation, is necessary, with some very good human data as input. And I believe that we don't like that role, but it's a necessary role, it's an important role. And the kind of interpretation that goes with confrontation is part of our stock and trade. And, by the way, if you watched Carl Rogers lately, you see how confronting he is at times.

Let me move on to power. I'm very, very impressed with a recent statement by Hannah Adams in the New York Review on violence. She has an interesting formula which I'd like to share with you. She says that "The incidence of violence is a direct index of lack of power. The more powerless a group, an individual, a society is, the more violent it becomes." So if your're concerned about violence, look at the other end of that coin and interpret it into powerlessness and power. And then the corollary to that one is that "the degree of repressive action by the bureaucracy is an index of its political insecruity. So you can interpret Rutgers by ceding to the demands of the students, which you seem to be terribly upset about, as an index of its political insecurity, because they were not repressive. You can look at Columbia, that great institution--that hallowed place--on 116th Street--in terms of its repressive actions, as a rather politically insecure place. You can look at Harvard, and Radcliff, which has adapted a Black Studies curriculum, without much fanfare, with little sit-in at the Dean's office as a rather politically secure institution. And are you terribly surprised by that?

She makes a further point which I think is equally important, that bigness leads to disaster; to national and international and total disaster.

The bigger we become, the closer down the road to ruin we will move. It's interesting, that the more technologized, the more instrumented we become, the more likely it is that we will destroy ourselves.

Let me talk a moment about Black Power. The black student tells us today, "I want to find my own identity and I need the institution to provide this for me the way it has not been done before, because the institution has systematically robbed me of the means that any other ethnic group has had." And if you look at the 400 years of history you don't need much of an explanation. I listened to a black militant the other day who was telling me that he was walking in Denmark with a white girl about five years ago and she touched him and she said "You know your skin is beautiful." This threw him into a complete panic for days because no one had ever told him that he was beautiful--that his skin was beautiful. Now just translate that into campus terms; that one had to leave one's origins in a sense to be told on foreign territory that he is beautiful. If you ever encounter a black person in a very personal dialogue, ask him what the stocking-cap means to him, and then you might understand the preoccupation with the Afro-haircut and the Afro styles, and so forth. Just ask what the stocking-cap means and I think you will acquire a different kind of understanding. "Don't tell me"--I'm black now-- "about the double standards of black separatism because you have been living a double standard for years. How come it is that you are so readily moving the entire legalized machinery against black separatism when you haven't moved at all against white separatism for so many years? Paranoid? Perhaps I am, but after all it's natural for me to be paranoid because that's the basis of my experience." I have to extend myself beyond the usual way I extend myself to a student because of the barriers that are part of my history as a black person.

"So I ask you, what kind of a double standard are you willing to perpetuate?" The double standard that's been going on for such a long, long time, or the double standard that I may insist upon now in order to find my identity? Now I leave you with this question.

Perhaps one of the intentions of this conference is to create a caucus and to stop talking about our own definitions, and to take some action to assure that you will band together, to assure that you can do the kind of job that you say you're going to do, if you know what you're doing.

But black people and youth are not buying that. And they are not buying the plenary session approach. They watch the U.N. in operation, the great plenary session which is totally and completely paralyzing the world. They won't buy it. What they will buy is co-optation focused both ways, because they can be co-opted, they can be bought, but they can also write the proposal. They will capture the media and self-images and they will jam the system. That's their approach for producing change. It is not the working paper, the plenary session caucus approach. They may caucus; they may bring into their play, the media, and counselors, as change-agents. People have to understand that process. It is a different process. I think you might, as counselors, do a little co-optation yourselves and you might, as counselors, do some image making and some capturing of the media and some exploiting of the media. And perhaps it might not be so bad to jam the system occasionally, too.

The Generation Gap and the Culture Gap; what do young people want? They want a dialogue and they want to know what their options are. And I think we can provide both, very successfully and very, very completely. But the options today for a young man are very, very limited, and that's what it is all about. He can either go to the Army and take a chance of being killed, he can go to jail if he does't want to go into the Army, or he can go to school, or he can go and teach. Those are the options for a young man. And for a young woman it isn't so different because, in a sense, she is dependent on the young man, because she has to go where the marriage market is and the marriage market primarily is in the colleges. So, young people don't have any options today.

What about all of this gobbledegook that we are talking about; experimentation, and exploration and articulation--and what are some of the other big words that we have been taught; what are all the possibilities for exploration today? Can I as an 18 yr. old young man say I will not go to college this year, but I will take a year off and go to work, bum around, explore, take a trip, and so forth? No, I can't, because the draft board is going to get me and say "boom". So, I as a member of an institution have to take as a fact of my life and of my students' life that most of them are here because they don't have any other place to go, except to take the possibility of dying. I think this is something I have to take into account in my encounter with a college student. And I think I have to understand then, that the problem of the generation gap that we are so blindly and so blandly talking about is for an 18 yr. old a matter of life and death. Consequently, our middle class kids don't have many options and our lower class kids have even fewer options because of the limited kind of range of experience that they have had.

So, here I am again as a counselor with the possibility of creating some change, and the change has to be in the lower class, a broadening experience on drugs, the cops, and the landlord. This is the population that I have to focus on in expanding the experiences of lower class kids and get them out of their bind; not in self-concept terms. It is a very, very different kind of role that I have to play as a change-agent, as a counselor. I have to focus on the junkie on the corner, the corner guy who is running the rackets, the cop who is abusive for the most part; he has also become abusive to middle class kids and look how beautifully they have used the media, in Chicago, and any kid who is in any way involved in any kind of protest movement will tell you how often he has been beaten up by the cops; before Chicago occurred.

Now I will give you a very interesting and poignant example. One of the young people with whom I am working in therapy, was going to see a girl in Philadelphia. He and his friend drove down. The girl had a roommate. The two girls and the two guys were going to a party at midnight in Philadelphia and they decided to drive the girl's car. Very straight, very clean, no pot, no drugs, no acid, nothing. They stopped at a stop light, and in the jolt, the girl was wearing contact lenses and one of the contact lenses fell out, she became panicky and wouldn't move until she found her lens on the floor of the car. So picture this scene at twelve o'clock midnight in Philadelphia--four kids and a car at a stop light. The cops came, would not let the guys explain what it was all about; immediately started to search the car, became abusive when the kids insisted upon trying to explain, and ordered the boys out of town. Nice middle-class, wall-to-wall raised, with piano lessons and other kinds of middle-class privileges, and so forth, kids were victimized by the system. Now translate that into lower class terms where the options and the limitations are even greater, and then talk about relating and the generation gap and so forth with the kids. You have a very, very different kind of a role as a counselor and as someone who has to effect the system, and I am not being overly dramatic, really I am not. I think I am telling the situation as I see it through many, many young people's eyes, with whom I have talked, both black and white, middle-class and lower-class, and I think we saw some of it last night. Let us not be concerned about their morality and changing them, but let us rather be concerned about the system by which they live, and which is imposed and which is not self-creative and not self generated.

Now about schooling and education; we are not an educational system. We are a system of schooling, and conformity is the survival technique. Ennui is the survival technique; the capacity to deal with irrelevance under arbitrary learning sequences is the survival technique. Significant experiences? Yes, I can name the significant experiences in my education. My first grade teacher, my tenth grade English teacher and four University Professors, one of them being my freshman adviser in college, one of them being my doctoral dissertation adviser, and one Professor who was teaching Medieval History and another one who was teaching Constitutional History. And I am a psycohologist!

My own therapist? I am not including him as part of my schooling, I am including him as part of my education. He had an effect on me, but I am not sure whether he had the effect that he could have had, and I am not at all certain that a hell-of-a-lot more did not happen outside of my session with him than happened inside my sessions. Perhaps that is a credit and testimony to him.

Now my education, with a lot of trial and error, with a lot of all kinds of things, with a lot of traveling, a lot of poverty, a lot of hunger, Nazi Germany, Concentration Camp, reliving in the United States and all of those things, those are part of my education. Schooling has had a minimum effect although I have spent a lot of time there and perhaps part of the reason is, part of that part of my life has effected the militant stance that I may take now and the identification that I find with people whom I see as being oppressed, because I know what it is like.

If we are going to have young people endure 14 years of a school system, public or private, (whether you get your chits from the government, or negotiate for your own education, or the government pays the school system--doesn't make any difference) we are going to have to invent a different kind of educational process to make it meaningful. And the kinds of experiences that we saw demonstrated last night, that happen outside of the school system, are going to have to be incorporated, if possible. If not, then we are going to have to turn the kids over to different kinds of institutions and maybe the storefront is in fact a viable institution for today, although a settlement may not be. I think one of the things that we have to recognize is that there is no developmental psychological justification for a lock-step sequence with arbitrary learning input for 14 years and 16 years if you take the preschool years. None whatsoever. The justification is economics. You are becoming more and more productive in a more concentrated time period, in adulthood and you have to be kept out of the labor market, longer and longer and longer. Now if we as an educational institution and as a school system assume that kind of an economic burden, we had better let the world know what the score is. And we better let the world know that leisure and nonsense, trial and error, and travel and exploration, experimentation and all of the other things that kids need to do to develop mentally, has to be built into the program, or they are going to do it elsewhere and it is going to be less and less of a problem.

The schooling institution isn't suited for itself. But it is a reality that we have to cope with, because if we don't we are going to be less and less effective. And clearly, if we rise to the challenge we are going to be very, very different kinds of institutions and very different kinds of personnel from the kind of personnel that we have been up to now. And I think we don't need to be terribly, terribly differently educated from the way we've been, but we've got to use our education in a different way.

And what's our new role? Our new role is to be a change-agent, whether we're preceived that way or not by the kids right now, and we don't have to rely entirely on their preception. They don't structure our role for us, and they know it. They might keep us straight and they might say, "You aren't meeting my needs," which is very, very, important, but we don't have to go to them and say to them, "Tell us what we are to do." That is an abdication of our authority and we are in an authoritative position. We do have to go to them and say, "Are we meeting your needs" and of course the categorical answer to that one at the moment is "no."

Thank you very much!

OUTREACH TO THE DISADVANTAGED

by

Dorothy M. Knoell

American Association of Junior Colleges

Urban Community College Project

Assumptions About Disadvantagement

"Black" and "disadvantaged" are used synonymously by many predominantly white colleges which are now making serious efforts to increase their non-white enrollments. In the community colleges, however, "disadvantaged" has long meant "having low demonstrated ability to succeed in college," based on scores earned on one of the national college testing programs. Being free (or low cost), the community colleges have not sought to link poverty with disadvantagement in planning special programs and services. Having been instructed by the government to be color-blind in the treatment of their students, at least until recently, the colleges have ignored cultural differences related to the varied ethnic backgrounds of what are now regarded as the disadvantaged. It may now be assumed that color, poverty, and learning disabilities growing out of poor prior educational experience may all be serious impediments to profiting from higher education, if they do not in fact stand in the way of the individual's applying for admission to college.

The term "disadvantaged" is used by most but liked by none who are attempting to expand educational opportunity. It is preferable to the notion of "culturally deprived" since the groups to whom the term is applied assert (rightfully) that their culture is merely different from that of the white middle class. "Educationally handicapped" may imply a degree of pathological impairment which is unwarranted. Thus, the term "disadvantaged" will serve until or unless a more acceptable term is found.

The focus of attention recently has been on the black graduate of the urban high school who, when questioned about his possible interest in college appears to aspire to the professions while reading at the ninth-grade level. In reality, disadvantagement is everywhere, in everyone in one sense or another. It tends to be most prevalent and most serious in the cities but it is to be found in rural areas and even the seemingly affluent suburbs; among Chicanos and Indians and poor whites, as well as the blacks; and in the backgrounds of some with demonstrated academic potential, as well as among those without it. Some say that the suburban WASP's are the truly disadvantaged, because of the narrowness of their experiences. Certainly it is assumed that the bringing together of WASP youth and their opposites for common educational experience should enrich both. Very few individuals, whatever their ethnic background or social class, achieve their full intellectual potential in life, if it can indeed be measured.

For purposes of discussion and planning, the point of view is taken that every young person possesses some "college potential" which can be realized at least in part in a wide spectrum of programs in two- and four-year colleges, public and private, large and small. In working with the disadvantaged, however, it will be assumed that the job to be done right now is less one of finding "the right" college for each disadvantaged youth than of equipping each college to serve the disadvantaged in accordance with its avowed intent. The motto of the State University of New York, "Let each become all he is capable of being," might well be adopted by each college in service to the disadvantaged. Few colleges are now doing all that they might to make opportunity available, making good use of the wealth of research on teaching and learning, or giving needed support to the student services which are so necessary to insure instructional success.

Disadvantagement may then be defined for purposes of planning programs and services as color or ethnic background, poverty, and learning disability. Any two of the three conditions are justification for special attention by the colleges. Young people who are black and poor and doomed to failure in college (if the traditional predictors are valid) are indeed an object of particular concern on the part of the colleges. Black youth should not enjoy a monopoly of attention for there are multitudes of Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, Indians, and others who are deserving of attention. Students in work-study programs are needy, but youth from families below the federally established poverty levels are scarcely being reached at all at present. Remedial courses and programs for the not-quite-ready student should not be abandoned, but entirely new approaches are needed for young people scoring in the lowest decile of traditional college potential.

The Multiple Clienteles of Disadvantaged

In government, in the community, and on the local campus there is lively discussion concerning which (or how many) of the several possible clienteles among the disadvantaged the particular college should try to serve. The definition of disadvantagement in terms of color, poverty, and educational handicap does not in itself indentify a clientele. In setting goals and establishing priorities, account must be taken of the disadvantagement which is found in persons of all ages who might be helped by the college. Some have been in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps, the Armed Services; others are among the unemployed receiving public assistance, sharing their poverty with large families which are poorly educated.

The inclination of the college is of course to plan for the new high school graduate who is multiple disadvantaged or, preferably, to assist him while in high school so as to reduce his educational handicap. Modest federal funding has been made available for these purposes. More massive (albeit inadequate) federal funding has been allocated for disadvantaged adults of various ages and conditions for adult basic education, job training for both New Careers and more traditional employment, parent education, and community services. A very current federal interest is in about-to-be released servicement from disadvantaged backgrounds whose transition to civilian education and employment may be hazardous.

At the other end of the age range of the disadvantaged in whom the federal government is making an investment are the Job Corps trainees, the Neighborhood Youth Corps workers, the VISTA volunteers, and the Head Start children. The colleges have been somewhat uneasy about serving the disadvantaged high school dropout, at least while he is still a minor. They voice the fear that they will encourage a greater number of students to drop out of high school by doing so, while hoping that the public schools will improve almost instantly so as to eliminate the drop out problem. Other groups whom the federal government is concerned about, from an education-employment point of view, are the migrant workers, mothers in the Aid to Dependent Children program, employees in local community action agencies, and the poor of Applachia and similar locales.

No one asserts that a college should try to "be all things to all people," least of all the disadvantaged. Still, one may legitimately ask what role the colleges, collectively, should play in helping to alleviate the problem of educational disadvantagement among people of all ages. Colleges can work in many ways to help the disadvantaged, in addition to providing direct educational services to disadvantaged youth of college age. They may be agents of social change in the communities in which they are located, offering their personnel and physical resources to meet local poverty needs, and to effect changes in the quality of life in the community. This is not the college which is walled off from the community, which regards all non-students as unwelcome trespassers. Such attitudes were prevalent even before the recent disturbances on the campuses by students and others. Low minority group enrollments and their attitude of suspicion about the higher education establishment are at least in part a reflection of the long-standing isolation of the campus from many segments of the community.

A college may also serve the disadvantaged by making its programs more relevant, more significant in relation to societal problems. Desirable changes in the students' social beliefs and behaviors need to be made explicit. Training (if needed) and then credit or pay (or both) may be given for community services performed by the students off campus. Students may serve as tutors for children at various grade levels, recreation leaders, consumer education aides, and in many other capacities which might be supportive of improving conditions among the poor.

Basically, however, the colleges need to consider the many clienteles which it might serve in its regular programs and services, once efforts are made to bring them into the mainstream of higher education. Universal opportunity for at least two years of education beyond the high school is an established national goal of some years standing. The role of each college in helping to achieve the goal should be discussed fully on each campus, in each region, and as part of a national plan.

Major Areas of Programming

Any comprehensive plan to serve disadvantaged students at the baccalaureate level should include both pre-enrollment programs and intensive supporting services after admission to the college. In fact, colleges should probably forego attempts to serve disadvantaged youth of college age unless they are prepared to back up their offer of admission with a full complement of services. Pre-enrollment programs may involve both direct instruction, e.g., through Upward Bound programs and tutoring in neighborhood centers, and personnel services, e.g., recruitment, testing, and placement in part-time jobs. Once in college, the disadvantaged student continues to need tutoring and financial aid but, in addition, will probably need certain rather intensive supporting services in counseling, out-of-class activities, skill development (including study habits) and perhaps housing in the community.

Residential colleges may tend to reject the proposal of pre-enrollment programs in their local communities, on the grounds that they draw their students from a vast service area and serve very few local high school graduates. By the same token, commuter colleges in urban areas may object to offering such programs on the grounds that the best participants would then be offered admission by the more prestigious residential college. The common denominator seems to be mutual assistance to each other's potential students while they are still in high school and before they make any final decision about college. Both the assisting colleges and the students--present and future--should benefit from such exchanges. The recipients of the pre-college services will be afforded an opportunity to try to qualify for admission to a variety of colleges, rather than a single institution on a kind of pass-fail basis. The college offering such services to local high school students will be enriched by the contacts with its community, particularly if its students and staff are involved actively in the program.

Examples can be cited of both federally funded and locally sponsored programs now in operation. Programs to extend educational opportunity to the severly disadvantaged are costly and may bring unwanted outcomes, as experience during the past year has indicated. Provision of some measure of expanded opportunity may produce a militant demand for more and still better opportunity. The offering of inadequate opportunity to qualify for the best in collegiate opportunity is to bring about disaster to the college which attempts it. Inadequacy may take many forms, but the best insurance against it is a comprehensive program of instructual and personnel services both before college admission and afterwards.

Pre-college Programs

Recruitment to college starts at an early age in upper middle class families, by parents who aspire for their children to attend "good" institutions, to obtain a "better" education than they themselves had. Parents of the so-called disadvantaged children tend not to value education as a vehicle for mobility, at least not beyond a high school education. Poor performance of their children in the public schools does much to confirm their feeling that higher education is "not their bag." Therefore, if the disadvantaged are to be served by the colleges in increasing numbers, action must be taken early to recruit them into higher education. This will mean creating interest, motivation, resources, and finally some increased capability to do successful college work, as a result of becoming oriented toward college while still in the public schools.

Specific Examples: Families of children in Head Start programs are the intended beneficiaries of a special federally funded program being offered by the State University of New York Urban Center in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area, with the cooperation of the New York City Community College. Educational and recreational programs are offered by the college center (very often in the facilities) for families as units. Parents are counseled and placed in educational programs appropriate to their adult interests and capabilities, from basic literacy programs to college-level, degree-credit courses. The expectation is that change will occur in the general family attitude toward the value of formal education and that better school performance on the part of the children will then occur. Both attitudinal changes and increases in the effectiveness of parents as "teachers" are expected to have impact on the learning of the children in Head Start programs and subsequently in the public schools. The offering of the program by a collegiate institution, located in the community where the families live, is believed to have greater potential impact on the disadvantaged community and on the individuals, both young people and adults, than would occur if the same program was offered by some other agency. Frustrations are many and results are slow to show. Still, an increased awareness of the college's presence in the community and of its accessibility to the disadvantaged has already occurred.

The Office of Education "Educational Talent Search" program is designed to assist colleges and other educational agencies to identify and counsel young people about education opportunity at all levels, i.e., in high school for actual or would-be dropouts and in college for those who might profit from such opportunity. Colleges receiving grants under this program may not recruit only for their own institutions but, instead, must offer services to a broad spectrum of young people who may be counseled into an equally broad range of educational programs. The talent search has not been limited to the urban disadvantaged, although some of the best programs have been designed for this group. Awards have been made to search out talent among rural youth, American Indians, Chicanos, and the disadvantaged in the southern states, as well as the more publicized disadvantaged.

Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland has been the grantee for a counseling and referral center in the Hough area, under the Talent Search program. A total of 780 counselees were served by SEARCH in Cleveland during the center's first year of operation, a majority of whom entered some type of educational program. In addition to counseling, the center assisted its clients in obtaining financial aid in order to continue their education and in maintaining a follow-up service to provide further assistance, as needed. The project includes an aggressive outreach program into the community, to recruit dropouts and others back into formal education. An attractive newsletter is published monthly with a circulation of 3000 copies, which features useful occupational information for the Center's clients. The future of the SEARCH program without federal funding is rather dismal for the people who are assisted cannot afford to pay for the services rendered. Still, good experience has been accrued in the 75 projects across the country which were funded last year, which colleges can apply to their own operations to make them more effective.

Other recruitment techniques used by the colleges to reach the disadvantaged involve the extension of the college staff to include other types of personnel, some of them paraprofessionals. One urban college has experimented successfully with putting certain high school counselors on its payroll, for service after regular school hours and on Saturdays in the high schools where they are regularly employed. Their mission is to recruit students for the community college--new types of students who would not go on with their education without some special encouragement from the school. Admission and often registration procedures are accomplished on the spot with the help of the high school counselor. Tuition waivers are available to the poor, and other financial aid may be secured by those who desire it.

College students have also proven to be effective recruiters, particularly those who reside in disadvantaged communities. One large urban college has devised a special work-study program for disadvantaged students who have been successful at the college, in which they are trained and then employed as counselor assistants to recruit more disadvantaged young people to the college and to work with them during the difficult early weeks on campus. In Baltimore, "New Careers" students have been employed by the community college to search out potential students in poor neighborhoods, armed with a kit of materials about opportunities at the college (and personal, successful experience on the campus, themselves).

The long-term goal in many of the community-board recruitment programs is to raise the general level of educational aspiration on the part of the disadvantaged, while recruiting certain individuals to the campus as full-time students. High school counselors in large urban schools have not been effective recruiters for the community colleges, except when special inducements have been offered. It is perhaps not surprising that their efforts are devoted to securing admission to and scholarships for the more prestigious colleges which are now competing for talented black students. The community must then overcome their own inertia in recruitment, while finding more effective ways to increase interest in the impoverished segment of the community.

There are still other techniques which appear to be effective in arousing the interest of disadvantaged young people whom the colleges have failed to reach in the past, and yet which cost relatively little to use. (The potential cost comes, of course, with a marked increase in enrollment of students requiring substantial financial aid, many of whom will also need special programs and supporting services.) One urban college president has proposed sending congratulatory letters to all new high school graduates, awarding them outright admission to the college and an offer of assistance to make enrollment possible. Still another, with flexible open-door policy, has proposed sending such a letter to all junior high school graduates, contingent of course upon their completing a high school program. The automatic early admission of such young people might open the way for better occupational counseling before actual college admission and for greater interest in high school courses leading to a college-level occupational curriculum. The Forest Park campus of the Junior College District of St. Louis has been bold enough to bus junior high school students to their campus for a Saturday visit, at which time T-shirts (and other inexpensive items) with the college seal were given to the children.

The federally funded Upward Bond pre-college program is known to all who work with disadvantaged college students. A number of variations have developed with other fundings, which are worthy of attention. The City University of New York has sponsored a university-wide College Discovery Program for its community colleges and a SEEK (Search for Education, Elevation, and Knowledge) program for recruitment to its senior colleges. The latter has subsequently been expanded into New York state beyond the city, through the central administration of the State University of New York. The programs represent a major attempt to increase minority group enrollments in the city and State University colleges, by recruiting and then assisting the disadvantaged in qualifying for degree programs in these institutions. One of the several prongs of the College Discovery Program involves the identification of poverty youngsters with low achievement but presumed aptitude of the ninth-grade level, and their enrollment in a three-year remedial program prior to high school graudation. Successful completers are guaranteed admission to some college in the City University, depending upon how well they have done. Supporting student services are also available to the group.

Many community colleges are encouraging their students to tutor high school and in some cases elementary school students in poverty neighborhoods. Much is done on a volunteer basis, e.g., through the EPIC program in the Los Angeles area. Elsewhere, needy college students are being paid in a kind of off-campus work-study program. Disadvantaged students in the College Readiness Program at San Mateo College, who are themselves the beneficiaries of special services, are paid to tutor students below college age who are still in the public schools, using the skills they are learning while being tutored by academically successful classmates. In the Peralta Junior College District in Oakland, some students in the OEO-funded Student Service Corps have been paid to tutor children out in the community, often in the neighborhoods where they themselves live.

Too often, disadvantaged students are denied some of the supporting services they need, until they are actually enrolled in the college. Selection of the appropriate college and courses of study, making application for financial aid, aptitude and placement testing, personal counseling about family problems, and making arrangements for medical exams (and possible remediation) are all pre-enrollment activities which potential students with disadvantaged backgrounds find it difficult to undertake. The families of more affluent youth have both experience and know-how in gathering information about college opportunities, getting help needed to make decisions, meeting deadlines, filling out forms, and most important of all, complaining when red tape and bureaucracy interfere with educational opportunity.* The Project Search Center operated by Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland provides some such pre-college services to potential students before admission to any institution. Assistance is given to clients in seeking financial aid under established programs; aid from Search funding has been given in some cases where other aid was not available.

Project FOCUS (Fellowship of Concerned University Students) was organized by university students to assist Upward Bound participants in locating a suitable college placement, obtaining needed financial aid, finding housing, and making other pre-registration arrangements to attend college in a usually distant state. The program has operated with the cooperation of several Upward Bound projects, usually in southern institutions, and they experienced considerable success in placing students in public community colleges, notably in California. Service to the students does not stop when they are enrolled but the major thrust of the program is in placing students in suitable colleges where financial aid is assured, from some combination of institutional funds and local contributions from the community. FOCUS is a kind of piggyback project, building on the Upward Bound program and, by the addition of services which at first were for the most part volunteer, making college admission a reality for many disadvantaged youth who might not otherwise have made it from Upward Bound to college.

---

*"Are Our Colleges Really Accessible to the Poor?" Junior College Journal, October, 1968 (30:2), pp.9-11.

With the assistance of the federal Talent Search program, a number of community and regional groups have organized to deliver necessary services to disadvantaged youth who might, with an extra assist, be able to attend college. The California Council for Educational Opportunity, Aspira in New York City, the United Scholarship Service in Denver, and the All-Indian Pueblo Council are all examples of recipients of Talent Search funds to provide services to the disadvantaged who are potential college students. Educational programs are needed at the pre-college level--tutoring, enrichment, occupational orientation--under the auspices of the local colleges and with the assistance of both staff and students. However, the educational programs will be effective only to the extent that supporting services are given at critical times along the route to college. Remediation will be futile unless application forms for admission to the "right" college are submitted, financial need is established, required examinations are taken, and the like. Despite the many apparent talent searches by the college, the procedures for admission which they often establish tend to discourage the disadvantaged from applying, if not in fact make it impossible for them to do so.

Special In-College Programs

Until recently, most community college programs for the disadvantaged have been remedial in nature and open to all new students with low scholastic aptitude test scores (if, in fact, enrollment in remedial courses is not compulsory for such students). The colleges have long prided themselves on their performance of the salvage function for high school graduates and others who are not ready to undertake the degree programs for which they have come to college . Some new students show need for remidial English, many (or most) for special help in reading improvements, and a large number for pre-college level mathematics. The latter group includes some who simply did not attempt the high school mathematics courses they later found they needed in order to pursue a certain major in college. Others took the necessary courses but did not do well enough in them to be able to go on with college-level math with any reasonable probability of success, or to pass some all-college requirement based on a minimum test score.

Colleges which are truly open door, in practice as well as philosophy, are finding that an increasing percentage of their new students need remediation in all of the basic skills and, in addition, need special help to develop adequate study habits and special counseling to make decisions about their educational and occupational futures. As a result, many colleges have moved toward a kind of remedial curriculum for seriously deficient students, which may constitute their entire program for the first year. The normal amount of time spent in the classroom is augmented by special laboratory sessions, tutoring, and the use of programmed materials for homework assignments.

There is considerable variation among the colleges with respect to certain important features of the program, among them the degree of structuring (or flexibility), criteria for assignment to and release from the program, grading practices, the awarding of degree or other type of credit, and staffing for the program. The extremes which may be found are the colleges which offer little more than an uncorrelated assortment of non-credit remedial courses to students who have made low scores on one or more aptitude tests, and those which have developed student-centered programs of skill building and guidance, to provide for the needs of the very heterogeneous group of of students in need of remediation. Traditionally the programs have been designed for (and effective with) middle class youth who fall only somewhat short of the standards set for students in college level courses. The typical student was a young white male high school graduate who underachieved in his mid-adolescent years. Most colleges admit to remedial programs some men and women who pursued terminal occupational programs in high school and thus lack the requisite academic and study skills for college. Finally, in each freshman class there is a certain unknown percentage of students who do not have the capability for traditional college programs--liberal arts or technical, no matter how much remediation they are given.

Instruments and techniques which are presently available to identify young people with undeveloped potential for college are grossly inadequate. Thus programs are needed which will give each educationally disadvantaged student an opportunity to develop whatever and however much college potential he possesses--not in competition with other students from more or less advantaged backgrounds, but in accordance with his own developmental characteristics. Probably all two-year colleges offer remedial-type courses in English composition and mathematics to the multitude of students who made low scores on the SCAT, SAT, and ACT instruments. A growing number offer what are called developmental, guided studies, or general studies programs for the seriously deficient students. Most will have been in the lowest one-third of their graduating classes; some will be blacks or Chicanos. There has been little or no adaptation of the content of the programs to the special needs of minority group students, even when they outnumber the white students in the developmental program. A number of the programs have employed black staff members as instructors and counselors, however, and tutors--particularly the volunteers--working with black students are for the most part black.

Examples need not be given of the tradition remedial courses and programs for they are commonplace. However, several developmental-type programs are worthy of note. The Forest Park campus of the Junior College District of St. Louis has developed one such program, with funds from the Danforth Foundation. It is in a sense a total curriculum for one academic year, for marginal students who are variously disadvantaged. Subsequent placement in a degree program offered by the college is regarded as only one of several possible outcomes, for what is expected to be fewer than half of the students. The two other major objectives are placement in a job training program offered under non-college auspices, and placement in a full-time job offering opportunity for advancement and related to the student's interests and aptitudes. The curriculum includes basic skills, using programmed instruction; general education for personal enrichment; and intensive group and individual guidance aimed at self-knowledge and evaluation. Tuition scholarships are awarded to certain needy students without respect to their academic prospects. The program is still relatively new and more expensive than the regular degree-credit programs. However, if the three-fold statement of objectives is accepted as valid, the rate of student success is high.

Los Angeles City College also offers a special semester-long developmental studies program for students who score below the tenth percentile (national norms) on a college aptitude test. It is regarded as a block program of courses in reading, speech, and psychology, in addition to which students may elect one degree-credit course from a restricted list. Tutoring--individual and group--is available to students in connection with the reading course, to help students learn to abstract information from their reading. Some tutors are paid; others are volunteers. The program appears to be offered as a means of assisting the disadvantaged to improve their probability of success in regular degree programs, rather than to screen out those whose potential for success does not improve markedly. Enrollment in the program is voluntary and advancement to degree-credit programs is open to non-failing students.

The State University of New York Urban Centers in Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant, operated by Manhattan and New York City Community Colleges, offer what they call college adapter programs as part of their overall offerings for disadvantaged youth who are inadmissible to associate degree programs. Remediation in the basic skills is emphasized, accompanied by intensive counseling to help the student understand himself. Urban Center students are permitted to participate in some courses and activities on the main campus, both to help them feel a part of the college and to ease their transition to the campus, if and when they are accepted into an associate degree program.

New Curriculum Development

Two significant directions for curriculum development may be noted that are of special interest to the disadvantaged, and which may pioneer some very basic changes in the concepts of what is transfer versus occupational. The New Careers program in the human services provides one direction; the Afro-American and other ethnic studies program is the second. Both provide new access to higher education for minority groups who are now underrepresented in the college population and who tend to be disinterested in strictly vocational training. The entry point may be at the level of adult basic education, sub-freshman skill courses, or full-credit programs. There is no one termination point which all students are expected to reach. Instead, some will complete a baccalaureate degree (or more), others will stop with an associate degree, and a sizeable group will drop out after only one year in the program. The open-endedness of the new programs--both at entrance and exit--is one of their most attractive features, together with the relevance of the content and learning experiences to the disadvantaged.

The so-called New Careers Program is a federally funded program of education, skill training, and work experience in the human services for employed adults over twenty-one years of age. A large number of urban community colleges have entered into contract with local agencies to supply some or all of the educational component of the program--basic adult education, counseling, job-related courses, and general education. As a result of early successes with New Careers students, the colleges have become less cautious about moving these students into regular college courses for degree credit. Completion of an associate degree may take as long as three years since a considerable portion of the student's time is spent in on-the-job training and in basic education at the start of his program. Still, persistance and time needed to complete degree requirements compare quite favorably with the record made by other community college students. New Careers training is offered in a variety of human services--social welfare, education, recreation, early childhood programs, police service and corrections, and, of course, the vast field of health. Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland has moved from the training of New Careerists as casework aides and home health aides to programs for a variety of municipal employees as plumbing inspector aide, water serviceman aide, interviewer aide, police and safety aide, and others. The major elements of the program are counseling, basic education (in which a trainee may earn up to 36 hours of degree credit, depending on his skill and when he enters the program), technical education in the speciality area, and on-the-job training. Other colleges which appear to have exemplary programs of New Careers training are Merritt College in Oakland, Miami-Dade Junior College, and the community colleges in New York City.

Related to the development of New Careers programs is a curriculum project in the human services which was recently funded through the Council on Social Work Education, to develop guidelines for associate degree programs for the social services. Briefly, the major objectives of the guidelines are to increase opportunities for disadvantaged students, alleviate the shortage of personnel in the social services, and encourage the development of sound programs in two-year colleges which may lead to either employment in the social services or a baccalaureate degree program in a senior institution. Field work for credit is to be recommended as part of the associate degree program. If provision can be made to pay students for their field work, the program will become more accessible to the disadvantaged. In any case, it is expected that the open-endedness of the curriculum, its mix of general education and field experience, and its emphasis on the human services will all be attractive features to the disadvantaged, and to other community college students who tend to reject technical education.

The second significant development in the community college curriculum field is the addition of ethnic studies programs. These are not new, of course, to the four-year institutions. However, two characteristics of the community college programs may distinguish them from those of the universities, if present trends continue. First, the ethnic studies program might serve as a substitute for present developmental programs for some disadvantaged students who can develop their verbal skills very rapidly when motivated to do so by the content they are dealing with. Black students are frequently "turned off" by materials used in remedial college programs, as they were by their high school courses. Given an opportunity to enroll in courses they view as relevant, they are able to progress more rapidly and to earn degree credit while doing so. The second distinguishing characteristic is the opportunity for employment which such programs may offer. There is a vast shortage of teaching personnel for special ethnic studies programs, in both the public schools and colleges. It appears possible that graduates of associate degree programs can be employed in the public schools as certified teaching assistants, to extend the limited resources of the present staff in community college programs, perhaps while continuing their education in a baccalaureate institution. Merritt College in Oakland has had probably the greatest amount of experience with an ethnic studies program in, as one might expect, Afro-American Studies. Los Angeles City College has recently developed a similar program and other community colleges are rapidly adding courses in order to be able to award an associate degree in the field.

Relatively little outside funding has been available to the colleges to provide needed supporting services to disadvantaged students in regular degree programs, to enhance their chances for success. An exception is San Mateo College in California, which instituted a very intensive program of tutoring and other supportive services for its disadvantaged students who enrolled directly in university-parallel programs. The group was small, the cost was high, and the academic success of the group was satisfactory. (Blacklash came from the college's inability to expand the program to meet student demands.) Los Angeles City College is also experimenting with the use of student counselor assistants to provide supportive services to new disadvantaged students, to supplement the tutoring which has been a part of the program for some time. Minority group students who have been successful at the college are trained and paid to assist the new students who appear to have a low probability of success, as a kind of extension of the professional counseling service.

The new federal program of Special Services to the Disadvantaged should assist the community colleges materially in improving the chances for success of the disadvantaged who enroll. Recruitment is no longer a problem; comprehensiveness of program is pretty well assured, although improvement is needed in the remedial or developmental curricula. The colleges fall short in providing the supporting services which are needed, if the disadvantaged are to stay in college and succeed.

Problems and Issues

Readiness of the Colleges. Community colleges have been growing at an exceedingly rapid rate over the past decade--numbers of colleges, credit of program, size of enrollments, and staffing of all kinds. As they have grown, they have attracted and in a way absorbed minority group students in a kind of color-blind approach which was dictated by practice until recently. The colleges are not entirely ready to accommodate large numbers of presently militant minority group students, either psychologically or financially. A climate of acceptance is still in the process of being created on the campuses; in which the new students, the traditional middle class students, and the faculty and staff can work effectively to resolve the conflicts which are sure to arise. The problem is in a way one of the chicken and the egg: to try to get the college ready for an influx of new minority group students, or to bring them on campus now to assist in the sensitizing process?

Money. External funds are needed for aid to students, for increased student services, and for new programs. Direct aid to the students is perhaps the most critical problem for the truly poor are unable to attend even a free or low-cost college. The disadvantaged tend to reject the notion of loans and are in turn rejected by the lenders, even of guaranteed loans. Additional funds are needed for work-study programs, educational opportunity grants, and, in some cases, direct payments to students whose families are on welfare. Work-study funds can be used in part to provide improved services--tutoring, counselor assisting, and recruitment in the community. Education in the two-year college has been sold as "cheap," to the student and the taxpayer alike. Current per student costs are too low if the disadvantaged are to be served adequately.

Remediation. Too many colleges have organized programs on the assumption that if some remedial courses were beneficial for marginal students, then a triple dosage of remedial courses would be good for the seriously deficient students. The dosage has tended to kill the disadvantaged student who is impatient to gain access to what he regards as the "real thing" in college. Better, quicker means must be found to bring the disadvantaged into the mainstream of higher education, if the colleges are to continue to attract them. Vocational skill training is not the answer for most black youth, apparently. Instead, they are insistent that they be helped to acquire the academic skills they need in order to succeed in degree programs.

Student Personnel Staffing. White middle class student personnel workers, however well trained, tend not to be accepted by lower class non-white students. The rejection is based in part on the feeling by black students that communication is impossible because the white person cannot know how it feels to be black. College recruiters, admission officers, and counselors in particular find that they are comparatively ineffective in working with the disadvantaged.

Middle class black staff members who have not themselves experienced the hardships of urban poverty are scarcely more effective than their white colleagues. One approach to the staffing problem is stepped-up recruitment of the disadvantaged into college student personnel work, including increased assistance in obtaining the necessary training. At the same time, the use of paraprofessionals in student personnel work needs to be explored seriously by the community colleges.

Local Priorities and Goals. Few colleges feel that they have fully adequate resources for the traditional liberal arts and technical education programs which have long been their forte. Pressures are strong to add occupational curricula, reduce teaching loads, and to improve services to the nearly-prepared students. Most colleges are hesitant (if not actually unwilling) to reorder their priorities, to reallocate their resources so as to do the job well. Federal funding for special programs and services has not been forthcoming to date. Even student financial aid from the federal government has been too stingy to make it possible to accommodate the truly poor whose academic potential at entrance is uncertain. The problem then is how far the locally controlled college can go--should perhaps, go--in giving the needs of the seriously disadvantaged a higher priority than those of its middle class clientele.

PROBLEMS IN THE SOCIALIZATION OF THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE STUDENT

by

Lou Lieberman, Assistant Professor

Department of Sociology-Anthropology

SUNY-Albany

With tear gas and fixed bayonets as a response in other state universities to the apparently increasing dissatisfactions of some students with the present system of higher education, we may be tempted to feel unduly secure in attempting to cope with potential problems before they become uncontrolable. However, I suggest that the focus of this workshop may be much more related to the growing crises in the four-year college than it may at first appear. This is not to deny that there are problems unique to the two-year colleges which are not shared by the older four-year colleges but that on certain levels the similiarities far outweigh the differences. It is important to be aware that, as the base of higher education becomes democratized from an institution for the relatively few youth elite of a society to a broad based common education for all, problems of higher education become magnified by the ever increasing number of students from all levels of the economic strata, a wider diversity of ethnicities, as well as a greater variance in capabilities.

Although the similarities between the junior college and the four-year college student may not be too great, there are some differences which should be noted which may have a bearing on the adjustment of the student to the two-year college. In K. Patricia Cross's survey of studies of the junior college student[1] she notes: "There is an extremely high probability that any carefully designed research study will find large and diverse samples of junior college students...achieving lower mean scores on academic ability tests than comparably selected samples of four-year college and university students.[2] ...Research findings demonstrate that parents of junior college students tend to have lower socio-economic status than parents of students entering four-year colleges and universities.[3] ...As a group, junior college students have lower educational and occupational aspirations than students who begin their higher education in senior colleges.[4] ....Junior college students have a more practical orientation to college and to life than do their more intellectually disposed peers in four-year colleges...They are more likely to be cautious and controlled, less likely to be adventuresome and flexible in their thinking.[5]....Junior college students do not feel as well prepared for college as four-year college students as a group, they are less confident of their academic abilities.[5]"...

While none of Miss Cross' findings come as a great surprise, they nevertheless, do have serious implications for guidance and program planning in the two-year college. If these institutions will continue to draw heavily upon the lower socio-economic classes as the source for student recruitment, more attention needs to be paid to the possibility of discontinuities between the norms, values, and goals of the lower-class subcultures and the middle class oriented colleges.

---

[1] Cross, K. Patricia, The Junior College Student: A Research Description, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, 1968

[2] Ibid, pg. 47

[3] Ibid, pg. 48

[4] Ibid, pg. 49

[5] Ibid, pg. 51

Sociologists are fond of pointing out that successful role performance is usually preceded by adequate socialization into the norms, expectations and obligations of that particular role. In military service we have basic training or "boot" camp to enable a civilian to become socialized into the competent performance of his role as a military man. We do not assume that a civilian is an adequately performing soldier by virtue of his donning a military uniform. Similarly, training into the priesthood involves preliminary lengthy stages of socialization to the norms governing the attitudes and behavior of the priest role. Graduate school is seen as instrumental in the socialization of the college graduate into the role of a professional. With the latter illustration, however, we do not have a period with which we socialize the graduate into his role performance as graduate student. There is an assumption in graduate schools that upon entering the student is capable of performing his role as a graduate student. This assumption is somewhat realistic because of the selection processes which permit, for the most part, only those students who have already performed successfully in the college student role to be admitted into graduate school where he will carry out the role of graduate student in much the same manner. The processes of socialization, as described by George Herbert Mead[6] and others,[7] go far beyond the mere passive acceptance of the dictates of role performance. They also involve interaction between the role members with appropriate definitions, testing, punishments and rewards as well as repetitions of behavior engaged in or observable to the newcomer. The various mechanisms of role learning permit the individual to "generalize" the attitudes or predispositions to act on those others who occupy the different roles in that particular set of role relationships, e.g., the doctor-patient relationship. When he has generalized these attitudes and has made them part of his self, we assume then that this person knows what the appropriate behavior will be and what will be expected of him. At that point he is usually capable of responding appropriately to the requisites of the situation for which specific role performance is needed. In order to accomplish this, as Mead points out, it is necessary for a relatively high degree of consensus to have been established in terms of the symbols to be utilized in the learning of new roles.[8] When one looks at the movement of the high school student into college ,what is remarkable is that this complex socialization process is almost entirely ignored as a legitimate area of study and concern. Either the student learns on his own,---usually from other students---what the performance expectations of the college student are, or his skill as a student may become diminished by the degree to which he has not learned what is expected of him. From the perspective of the role of teacher however, we have a tendency to assume that by virtue of having been admitted into a two year or four year college, the youth is capable of fulfilling his student's role. If he fails, the blame is usually placed on "poor motivation", "laziness", "low I.Q.", etc. However, in order for

---

[6] Mead, George H., Mind, Self and Society, ed. by Charles W. Morris, Phoenix, Edition, University of Chicago Press

[7] For example, Brim and Wheeler, Socialization after Childhood; Manis and Meltzer (ed), Symbolic Interaction; Biddle & Thomas (ed), Role Theory; Paige T, Moral Judgement of the Child; Rose, Human Behavior and Social Problems.

---

8. Mead, Op. cit

the youth to fulfill his student role adequately he must have, through the process of socialization, learned not only what the role of student entails, but also that of the role of professor. The only model he has, unfortunately, to guide him when he enters the college is the teacher-student model of elementary and high school. The usefullness of this particular model for the higher education student-teacher relationship is questionable. The authoritarian position of the elementary and high school teacher, with emphasis upon the memorization of a body of material for the purpose of later examination, the lack of encouragement for individual initiative, the dull repetition of the all too frequent drillings, the relatively low power and prestige status of the high school student vis a vis the exalted high school teacher, as well as other all too familiar characteristics of the usual model certainly do not adequately serve to prepare the student for successful functioning on a college level where more than the learning of course content is involved.

Since it also apparent that the two year colleges are moving increasingly into the ghettos and attempting to engage Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Indians, and other minority groups into the academic mainstream of the two and four year colleges, the symbolic nature of the teacher-student model and relationships within the ghetto areas and among other minority group persons cannot be ignored. For example, as we have seen evident in the problems besetting the New York City school system, many Blacks will identify the white teacher with the repressive and exploitative aspects of the white community vis a vis the ghetto resident. The teacher is identified with the "establishment", the "white power structure", "whitey" the police, and other confused symbols of a power relationship in which historically the ghetto resident was the victim. He has often been made to feel inferior by being identified with such pejorative and derogatory terms as "culturally disadvantaged", "culturally deprived", "culturally handicapped" as well as other descriptive terms which amount to a form of racial or ethnic condemnation by categorization. The function of such labelling in producing a self-fulfilling prophecy would be worthwhile exploring, but is beyond the scope of this paper. The struggles of various communities to decentralize schools, thus giving to the community control in hiring its own teachers with whom the ghetto residents can identify, should not go unnoticed as one of the problems which has a bearing on the effective integration of many of the minority group members into the college community.

It would probably not be unreasonable to assume that most of the faculty and staff of the two year colleges are not only white but also middle class.. They are likely to be persons for whom middle class values, traditions and norms are accepted as the only ones worthy of consideration as standards for the behavior of students. What this frequently means is that a cultural gap exists between the middle class oriented college and the incoming lower class student. This gap may be seen in any number of ways. For example, when lower class students in high school or in college are known to have spent their time in going out on dates or playing ball or going to the movies or engaged in some other behavior which gives immediate pleasure, rather than having done their homework assignments, the attitudes of the teachers and couselors tend to lead to punitive or condemnatory actions or mannerisms toward these students, who are viewed as behaving immaturely. They are seen as "ungrateful", "too lazy to work", "stupid", etc, and these attitudes are more often than not communicated to their students. The fact that deferrment of gratification is not a norm which can, in all cases, be easily accepted by the lower class person, is frequently overlooked. In the depressed atmosphere of slum life, when one has an opportunity for pleasure to be obtained in the here and now, the temptation to take advantage of all opportunities for pleasure is much greater than it would be for the middle class person. There is a large body of literature which indicates the wide value discrepancy between the middle and lower class.[9] We find, for example, that the middle class student, both high school and college, has many more opportunities in his life style for the achievement of pleasure and satisfaction, than does the lower class student. Another illustration of the incompatibility of lower and middle class norms, relevant to the college milieu, is the lower class parents' lack of response to children who ask frequent questions. While there is a tendency for the middle class parent to reward a child for his curiosity and questioning and usually encourage this, we do not generally find this to be the case in the lower class. With their larger families, with the competition of more children for the attention of the parent, with the mother working harder in the home, there appears to be instead a tendency for reward to be given to the "good" boy or girl in the lower class family who does not bother the mother incessantly with "silly questions" which the mother doesn't know how to answer anyway. When one has not had numerous years of reward reinforcement for asking questions, is it not understandable that one does not bubble over with involvment in the classroom in which the role of the student is usually reduced to asking or answering questions? Another problem which may be raised by a lower class youth moving into the college world is the potential threat he poses to his peers and family who are not college oriented. In these communities, the induction of a youth into a special opportunities program, like EOP*, SEEK, Upward Bound or Outreach, questions the wisdom and validity of choice of the other kinds in the neighborhood who are not moving on to college but instead prefer to make money by working. When some of our EOP students go back to their community on weekends or vacations we find them frequently ridiculed by their peers who label their college attendance as "kid stuff." Frequently, the lower class child who goes on to the college places an added financial strain on the family due to his lack of contribution. This strain is sometimes reflected in the family urging the youth to drop out of college and "act like an adult." Another area of strain for the lower class youth is the very language which may or may not be considered appropriate in the college setting. He is not supposed to use the slang or local vernacular with which he is familiar. He is forced to readjust not only his speech patterns, but also his use of symbols in order to match and please the middle class teacher rather than to comfortably and naturally express himself with his own speech. Again, we have a reinforcement of the symbol of the establishment--the middle class white professor in this case--who may regard the speech as well as other mannerisms of the lower class as inappropriate to the situation. Perhaps the most important problem of all, however, is the tendency for the middle class teacher or staff member to look upon the lower class student as being in some way "disadvantaged", ergo inferior, because he does not share the same values, speech patterns, and behavior

---

[9] See for example,: Oscar Lewis, LaVida, The Children of Sanchez, Five Families; Warren Miller, The Cool World; Ellison Liebow, Talley's Corner; David Caplavitz, The Poor Pay More; Allison Davis & John Dollard, Children of Bondage; Lewis W. Jones, "The New World View of Negro Youth" and Arthur Pearl, "Youth in Lower Class Settings" in Muzafer & Carolyn Sherif, Problems of Youth.

*EOP - Educational Opportunities Program as he would like him to, therefore requiring the Professor to be tolerant with a child. Does this not, in many ways, extend the political "white mans' burden" concept into a social and educational relationship which in many ways is just as dangerous and disasterous for the lower classes as was the old political colonialism for non-western nations?

Ironically, however, even though the problems of socialization may be greater for the two year colleges, they may be easier to solve than on the university level. Whereas the four year colleges and universities are bogged down in traditional student-teacher relationships and are struggling to preserve the structure and content of a great deal of irrelevancy in the face of the rebellion of the youth, this does not necessarily have to be true of the two year college. Because of the relative newness of two-year community colleges, there is a possibility for the kinds of experimentation and innovation in education which could, in the long run, turn out to lead the way for the modification of the four year system, rather than having the two year system merely "ape" the four year system. This would require, however, the acknowledgement of many problems and the willingness on the part of students, faculty and staff of the two year colleges to experiment with the development of education which can benefit the community as well as students and faculty rather than to pattern its structure and content on pre-existing institutions, which have to some degree outlived their usefulness. In order to accomplish this a number of things can be done in the immediate future before the two year colleges become too rigid for easy modification. Perhaps the easiest of all would be the development of various kinds of role sensitivity training for all *staff* and *faculty* of our colleges. This training would be carried out *with* students in order to teach the faculty and staff a little bit about life other than the provincial, "up-tight" world from whence they came. Faculty and staff, including our counselors, psychologists and social workers need an in-service training program which will enable them to avoid the tendency to condescendingly tolerate the lower class person. In much the same manner similar role sensitivity training and deliberate socialization should be developed for the students to let them know what the role requirements are for a student, for a faculty member, and for the different staff positions within the academic world with whom they will interact. In other words, we must assume that many, if not most, lower-class persons (and many middle-class as well) do not know the rudiments of being a student. We must assume that the grade school teacher-student model is not a valid one for college. We need certain innovations such as teaching the faculty and staff how to read before we can effectively combat the high rate of functional illiteracy among our students. It has been my own experience that staff and faculty have almost as much difficulty in reading and understanding the written word as do the students. We need a constant dialogue with students, not only lectures, but dialogues where faculty and staff can climb down from our self created pedestals and learn from the students, as well as teach them. Let's have these students in our homes on a regular basis not as a form of charity but of community. Simple mechanisms such as parties with students and faculty together, including drinking parties, where we can mingle with one another as persons rather than maintaining the constant student-teacher model, can be useful in building a solid relationship. We need to teach the faculty and staff a good deal about the significance, meaning and complexity of the youth culture today as well as lower class culture and where it conflicts with the education process. To effectively reach the lower-class youth we need to know on a gut level something about the language, values, rational and symbols of those youths who will be coming to the two-year college in increasing numbers. We cannot assume that because we were once teenagers ourselves that we understand the youth of today as well. Faculty and staff need to learn about the significance and functional utility of drugs and sex for the high school student as well as for the college student so that we don't continue to look upon these as merely deviant or abberant behavior. Rather, let's take a realistic look at these behaviors from the perspective of the young as meaningful, desirable, and integrative experiences.

In closing I would suggest that socialization into the two year college must proceed two ways. It is not just the socialization of the student into the college, but equally important, the socialization of the college faculty and staff.

BEHAVIOR, ATTITUDES AND GOALS OF DISADVANTAGED YOUTH*

by

Dr. Carolyn Sherif

Associate Professor of Psychology, Penn State University

It is a particular pleasure to be with you at this workshop concerning students and future students now in high school in two-year programs at New York's community colleges. I was asked to speak on our research on young students and potential young students (adults--later). Since 1958, we--Muzafer Sherif and I--have been studying youth between ages about 13-20, in and out of school, in their own neighborhoods, in their hangouts, and in community recreation centers. The research has taken us and our assistants into areas of low, middle and high social status, among Negro-white, English-speaking, Spanish-speaking in a wide variety of cities and towns, first in the southwest and for the past four years in Pennsylvania and to a limited extent New York City.

Our research was conceived as basic research into the concerns, attitudes and goals of youth and their actual behavior, as these related to their background, facilities of their physical and social locations, and their belonging or not belonging to informal groups of their own choosing: their reference groups of peers.

You in community colleges of New York are among those pioneers in attempting to change the usual course of youth placed in a disadvantaged position through no fault of their own. Therefore, I come to learn as well as to inform. Exchange between programs of action and what is called basic research is essential to both, if either is to be viable. We have seen enough of the divorce between the two. On the one hand, ignoring what has been found in past both by educators and researchers: on the other, rushing to research because everything that is gold we touch. Research on human problems has no value unless it eventually can provide valid guides to action. Action must proceed, in the long run, on tested guidelines. Therefore, feedback from persons grappling daily with the reality of human problems is needed just as sorely by researchers as valid guidelines are needed by teachers, counselors and administrators. Why? To check validity of generlizations based on research.

---

*Transcribed from recorded tapes by the Two-Year College Student Development Center

Actually--over the ten years, we have received feedback from action programs in various states and communities. It is gratifying that our research does appear to bear on major problems faced by those who work with youth in various circumstances, is considered "IN" on their scheme of things--and with what effect. Everyone has someone or some set of people who are their judges of what counts, of how to measure up as a person, and of what to strive for: but for young people--for reasons we can go into later if you want--the IN CROWD is terribly important. Let me state one conclusion: with some exceptions, school is far from being the "whole of life" for youth and relationships with teachers etc. are far from the most significant. Nor are family ties as important as they once were. In the limited time, focus on findings that appear to have most direct relevance for assessing some prevalent conceptions about characteristics of "DISADVANTAGED", "UNDERPRIVILEGED", "LOWER CLASS", "POOR." We did find some conceptions lacking in factual basis. Why? Perhaps because our research methods differed from the usual. The technical details of the research are presented fully in publications. The important thing is that we have not relied solely on one method, especially not on self reports of youth or their answers to direct questions in person or with paper and pencil. We used a combination of methods: analysis of census and municipal statistics, surveys of living areas, especially to specify the ecology of their world; surveys of living areas, questionaires to see what they do and say when required to put the best foot forward; background data on individuals. But our primary focus was on extensive observation over periods of six months to over a year. Observation so devised that the youth being observed were not aware that they were being observed. The methods of observation were devised to circumvent a problem with which many teachers are conversant: adolescents are well aware of adult values and of how they are supposed to react to adult authority. They are adept in "putting the best foot forward" for adults as well as for age-mates. Thus, there are certain limitations to conclusions about youthful attitudes and behavior based entirely on data collected in interviews or from pencil-and-paper questionnaires when the young people know that adults want to find out something about them.

Youth have their ways of adapting to the inquiring adult, and they also have their secrets from adults. Two examples from our research will suffice to show the importance of these facts in research on youth: in one group from a lower-middle class neighborhood, most of the boys had dropped out of high school at 16 and 17. The boys with the highest standing in the group were attractive, neat boys whose manner to adult authorities at school was proper and ingratiating. To their pals, they delighted in defying authority through techniques that seldom exposed them to adult criticism but, instead, boomeranged on particular adults. Thus, they systematically harrassed a young recreation official until he lost his temper. They bragged privately that they would get this official replaced as unfit, as they claimed to have done with an earlier occupant of the same position. One's assessment of these boys, therefore, depended upon whether one knew only their words to adults about themselves and about the official, or whether one also knew how they harrassed the official and reacted to the events in the privacy of their own circle.

A second and more obvious example of the need for research methods that do not rely solely on verbal reports or interviews, was the discovery during the study that another group of boys, lower class in this case, had performed an act of vandalism. Specifically, they had broken the windows in the entire side of a large school, their justification to each other being the alleged mistreatment of one of their number by a teacher. Their joint participation in the deed was so secret that neither school nor police knew that they were involved; the crime was unsolved.

Let us turn now to some of the prevailing conceptions about disadvantaged youth that need to be examined in the light of the findings. Necessarily, we can give only conclusions about the findings, some of which are based on the intensive study of groups and some on survey findings in high schools. The first conceptions to be examined all stem from a view of the disadvantaged as a tightly-woven and closed "culture" within society.

1. Lower-class youth do not have the same wants as youth in other classes and are not, therefore, discontent in lacking certain things found in more comfortable settings. Perhaps the most striking result of our research was the similarity in desires for material comfort and possessions among youth of all classes and backgrounds. It can no longer be said in this country that the disadvantaged youth are not unhappy at lacking material comforts. The image of "success" in our culture is closely tied to material possessions, and youth in all its sectors envisage a future in which they want and expect to have the essentials: television, radios, telephones, nice clothing,

comfortable housing, and cars. The teen-agers we have studied, regarded a car as so essential as to almost be a birthright.

2. Closely related to the view that lower-class youth do not have the same wants as youth in other classes is the notion that education is little appreciated in the lower class and that lower-class youth are similar in devaluing education. Our findings do not support these conceptions. In the first place, considerable effort has gone into making a high-school education the minimum standard in this country. This effort is reflected in the fact that the vast majority of our youth are aware of the importance of completing high school and actively desire to do so, no matter what they may think about "school" at a given time. Secondly, while the proportion of youth who set college as a goal is higher in the middle and upper socioeconomic levels, there are substantial proportions in lower-class areas who explicitly desire post-high school and college training. To repeat, by the high school age, there are substantial numbers of lower-class youth who are relating themselves to an educational future on a par with those of any other class. When the means become available, these youngsters are the ones prone to take them and to utilize the opportunities.

The assumption that lower-class youth are "closed" to the influence of the rest of society and are somehow more alike than youth in other circumstances, may reflect the perspective of those from different and more favored backgrounds. A person encountering youth from a very different class may naturally feel that they are "all" very different from youth he has known.

3. Lower-class youth are not achievement-oriented, not ambitious. Like may researchers before us, we found that self-conceptions and the level of goals for future achievement differed significantly according to the socioeconomic background and cultural setting in which youth lived. One illustration

is the estimates made of the amount of weekly income considered necessary for subsistence, for prosperity, and as a personal goal ten years hence. In assessing whether or not lower-class youth are ambitious, we should compare their goals (1) to the present income levels of their families and (2) to their own conceptions of how much income is needed for a comfortable life.

By either measure, we found that lower-class youth (some of them in Spanish-speaking areas) were placing their own goals, on the average, at the very limit they conceived as prosperity. In short, there was little discrepancy between their estimat of what was needed to be prosperous and what they hoped to attain. Middle class and upper class youth, on the contrary, erect their future goals comfortably below the level they regard as "prosperous". Although they aim at a higher income than lower-class youth, they strain less to exceed their family level and less toward their own conception of comfort than lower-class youth. These findings suggest to us the value of re-appraising some of the current conceptions of achievement orientation, insofar as these attribute high goals to high inner motivation and neglect the effects of one's social contest in establishing the standards for achievement.

4. While this focus on money matters may seem a bit tangential to youth's attitudes and goals, the information obtained in our research has been useful in assessing attitudes and behaviors that are quite distinct from money. After finding from school students how much "spending money" they needed, we related their requirements for spending money to those of members in small groups in their areas. We found that school dropouts and potential dropouts typically indicate the need for twice to three times the weekly spending money desired by those in school. This is not accidental, of course, because dropping out of school is typically dropping into something else. Frequently, that something else for boys is a closely-knit group of age-mates

whose activities require more money than usual leads us to the central and most rewarding aspect of the research and to another conception about youth that needs to be clarified.

5. There is a widespread conception on the part of parents, teachers, and community that age-mate groups play only a minor causative role in shaping adolescent attitude and behavior and that this role is detrimental unless adults sponsor and program the group activities. This conception is reflected in the reactions of many adults to inquiries about teen-age groups. How many times have we heard: "We have no groups here. Most of the teen-agers have a lot of different friends. There aren't groups. Of course there are a few gangs and trouble-makers, but most of the children don't belong to groups."

By watching young people go about their business apart from the programed activities of adults, we have found that adults who hold this conception are operating under an illusion. The praise or blame for youthful conduct and goals are laid on the family, on the neighborhood, on the cultural setting, on the socioeconomic environment, and of course even on the schools themselves. There are grains of truth in these blanket assignments of praise or blame; however, each neglects the important fact that within all of these settings, youth themselves are in daily contact with each other in activities and concerns that are of great significance to them as persons.

Their period of life called "adolescence" in this country has been described in many ways. There is agreement that it places the individual in a dilemma, and that the universal response to the dilemma in this country is to turn passionately, even desperately, toward others of the same age level.

It is this "turning" towards peers that produces, over time, a proliferation of teen-age groups in areas of every socioeconomic level. Only a few youngsters are forbidden by circumstance or by personal inadequacy (as inadequacy is measured by adolescents) to enter the warm comfort of teen-age friendships. Even these few isolates are not unaware of what others think and do. What one wants to do, as we found over and over, is to prove oneself as a person in a circle of human warmth, through desirable experiences with persons in this circle, and with the objects and activities that define the "desirable" in that circle.

To the degree that human warmth is confined to the circle of other adolescents, the adult world becomes a sphere of strange intervention and arbitrary custom. Of course, what goes on among the adolescents is affected by adults, including the mass media in our society and including adults in their own neighborhoods and schools. Adults contribute to making youth appear an exciting and glamourous period while, at the same time, denying youth the opportunity to learn to initiate and conduct affairs responsibly on their own without continual supervision. The real opportunities for youth to exercise initiative are found in their unsupervised activities with those who count in their eyes--that is, their informal associations with other boys and girls who may or may not be in school, who may or may not be exactly their own age.

By watching young people go about their business apart from adults, we have found that there are regular patterns to these associations among them. Any teacher who watches closely in the lunch room, in halls, or as young people arrive and depart from school knows that this is the case. What cannot be seen in school is that there are significant and patterned associations of young people outside of school as well. There are groups of adolescents with destinctive organizations, values and standards for conduct in neighborhoods of all descriptions. The reluctance of adults in recognizing this fact leads us to ignore its importance and also accounts for surprises in the best of neighborhoods, not to speak of the worst.

The importance of age-mate association can be illustrated briefly through two contrasting cases, both from lower-class neighborhoods populated largely by Spanish-speaking and Negro residents. We have selected them to emphasize the importance of peer groups in shaping attitude and behavior, whether for good or for bad. In both cases, the socioeconomic backgrounds and educational level of families were low.

In one group, the parents, though low in educational background, actively encouraged their sons to continue in school and to keep out of trouble. Only one of its members had a family broken by divorce or separation. Yet, by sixteen, all but four of the boys had dropped out of school. Long hours were spent together. The group was the setting for good times, excitement and companionship. The boys who were in school were constantly under pressure of the feeling that they were missing out on something while in school. By studying them, it was possible to predict accurately within two months when two of the boys would drop out of school, one in his junior and one in his senior year.

Another group, in a similar neighborhood, actually served to keep its members in high school with the goal of finishing. The area had a high rate of delinquency and crime. The families were, if anything, more disorded than those in the group mentioned before. Three of their fathers were servicemen who left after their birth never to return. As a group, these boys decided to attend a high school entirely out of their area, a practice permitted in the city, because it had the best athletic teams. Being smaller than the boys in the more fortunate area where the school was located, they never succeeded in "making" the school teams. Despite this, they were absorbed in the activities of the teams and "their" school, forming a little world of their own in which attending that school and finishing together was achieved through mutual support.

These cases illustrate our general finding that age-mate associations during adolescence do have great importance for establishing an image of one-self, for setting goals and for maintaining activities toward them. We are not certain of all implications for actual school subjects, but problems must be approached with full recognition of the importance of youth's reference groups. Our findings suggest that the problems are not strictly problems of changing youth individual by individual. They suggest that changes toward a new identity, toward new goals, toward taking opportunity and maintaining the efforts must somehow be supported by others who count in our eyes. Perhaps, in the long run, it may be more fruitful, as well as efficient, to conceive the task as a change in values and goals for groups of youth. If such be the case, surely all involved will have to take courage and responsibility, not only to promote inconvenience to their schedules, to bear criticism, and to innovate in curriculum, but to commit themselves to pioneering experimentation in educating for the future. We take it that this commitment is a part of the program in which you are all involved.

Having extablished the fact I hope, that groups of youths are very important, let's all admit that as adults we also find our identities to a large extent in sets of people. You all have been talking about your roles as counselors and what it means to have the role of counselor, and we have seen sometimes that there are some little gaps perhaps between adults who are in administration; who are in faculty. I have been asked to address myself to the problems of change, as it involves relations between such groups as these. Not just between youth, but between youths, and adults, between adults and adults, between blacks and whites, etc. We have done some work on this in different research projects and the conception I have conveyed to you, I think, is a novel one. I know it is because it was developed by Muzafer Sherif who some years ago reacted against the social science provision, the study of attitudes, and said when we are studying attitudes, we're not just studying blind feelings; we're studying blind feelings that have ideas attached to them. So they're intellectual too, and they're not just some sort of a figure that we can put on a person's head and say she is X or 99 or something in prejudice and this person is 10 or something of the kind. He said that everybody that is attached to something has a certain range of things that they find desirable, that they'll accept, that are tolerable, there is a certain range of people with whom they can interact with warmth and then they have a range of objects and people and places that they find objectionable. Often they are more clear about that, than what they accept. And furthermore, he said, in between there often are ideas, people, places, events, on which people haven't committed themselves yet. The typical example might be when a new p problem arises and you've certainly never seen anything like that before, then how does your established attitude lead you to react to that? You may simply withhold decision and sit there and be quiet and not do anything. Or you might say "I don't know." There is, in short, an area of non-commitment, a little leeway, on many human acts. When you study the literature of attitude change, you find that very, very, very seldom is there any good evidence for change of attitude as a result of confrontation of two people with diametrically opposed ranges of acceptance. One accepting things here and one there, this one rejecting what's there, this one rejecting what's here. When the ranges of acceptance are of diametrically opposed sides, it typically leads to alternatives and one of course is open; overt conflict in a power struggle. "Well, obviously if he doesn't agree with me, and my group doesn't agree with his group, we'll just put the screws on him, or we'll fight." We'll have a power struggle and we're seeing a lot of this today. I don't think anybody involved in such a struggle, and young people should know this, will ever change his attitude toward you during the process. On the contrary, the inevitable affect of such power struggle is to solidify both sides, to convince people that their side is more correct than they might have thought when they started out. Now that doesn't mean that power struggles aren't necessarily important. It does mean that it doesn't effect change in the attitude of the opponent, and it never has and it never will. It may effect change so that another generation of people will have different attitudes and that's an important result on the part of struggles, but it's not changing attitudes on the spot.

The other possibility of course is simply a stalemate of possibility in which each party simply withdraws and becomes more and more convinced in the rightness of their view, and communication between the sides instead of becoming easier, simply becomes more difficult and even impossible over time.

Now, what does the research show us about attitudes of people with such different viewpoints? When can they change? Our own experimental work was done in campsites forming groups of boys. These were preadolescent boys among unacquainted boys, all from the middle class, white background, no broken homes, very, very healthy boys. They were then placed in situations in which conflict would develop between the two groups. This wasn't hard to do at all. The conditions were simply arranged so that over a period of time, if one group got what it wanted, the other was bound to lose. A win-lose proposition, and in this case it was prolonged, athletic competition that was used. Over a period of time, these healthy, normal, well-adjusted, cream-of-the-crop, middle-class boys, developed a great fight between themselves. They began to hate each other; they called each other names, some of which we never did print because we didn't think our colleagues would appreciate the young American boys using such nasty language. They finally came to the point where, like the case I was talking to you about before, they viewed each other from polar opposites and wanted nothing to do with each other. There was a great social distance between them. We tried a great number of things in this research to see what could be done if one had two groups this far apart, this alien to one another, to effect a change in attitudes. I will tell you some of the things we tried, just briefly, because it's interesting. How about distributing nice information about each group to both sides? All right, this was tried. Let's tell them that those other fellows are really fellows very much like yourselves, you know, and they're nice guys. And what was the reaction? "You don't know 'em. You don't know what you're talking about. We know them. We've been in contact with them and we don't want anything more to do with them because we know what they're like and you can't tell us what they're like." We had a minister coming to camp who held services for each group at their own request, and they arranged the services themselves. We asked this nice young minister to give us a sermon on brotherly love. So he gave it successively to each group and they both thought it was a nice sermon. It was really good and they liked the minister, but they went right out and they started talking about those "stupid other guys." The information did not, under those circumstances, help. We considered the possibility of having a truce negotiation between the leaders. We were deterred in this because before it could be initiated, one of the boys in one of the groups decided on his own that the time had come to bridge the gap. He was quite high-staged in that group, next to the top and he went over to the other group's cabin, prepared to say, "Let's bury the hatchet." He got to the door, but they saw him coming and were prepared with a basket of tiny little hard green apples that they had been collecting just in case they needed them. They started hurling those green apples at that boy who then turned tail and started running back to his cabin and was chased half the way with apples. And what happened to him when he got back to his group? You'd think he would receive some sympathy. He had made a gesture and he was rebuffed hard. His own group said he'd been nuts. "What did you expect of those people? You should have known better than to try to negotiate with them. You're bound to get something like that." So actually he lost a little status in the eyes of his fellows because he'd tried to go on out on his own.

We tried a series, a whole series of just contact situations, of just having them side by side in very, very pleasant things. The food at the camp inproved t175rememdously but they had to go to the dining room at the same time to eat it which they didn't like. Movies were shown. If they wanted to see the movie, they all had to be in the auditorium together. What happened? Did this contact breed communication and familiarity? No. They started in the dining room with what they soon called "garbage wars," and this started with somebody tossing a paper napkin across the room and pretty soon it was mashed potatoes, and it was stopped when the knives and forks started to be hurled on the ground, because that was a medical problem. This went on for several days and these opportunities for contact served only to reinforce each side's view of the other. Now, the conditions that did succeed in reducing tension over a period of time, not right away, that changed the fellows' attitudes toward each other, were the same conditions that Robin Williams of Cornell stated are the only conditions that are clearly shown to have reduced conflict and changed attitudes in interracial situations. These conditions involved not just a common goal that each group desired but a very compelling goal that each desired and neither can attain without the cooperation of both groups. It can't be attained if they don't go together and you just have to say, "All right, you can't do it unless you cooperate." In other words, there's a compelling motivational situation that to me had anything been done about it means that each group has to give up a little bit of their stubbornness, so to speak, and to interact for a time. We tried a series of such situations and right at first, you get cooperation all right, but as soon as the episode was over, back you go to the old pattern. It became very clear that it takes a series of such, what Muzafer Sherif has called "super-ordinate goals," super-ordinate in a sense of overriding or framing the particular problems of each group, and interaction toward them to effect change in attitudes on each side. Now this sounds like a big order but as far as research goes, we do know that this sort of a situation works. Then an interesting thing happened. Once this situation develops so that there are episodes of cooperation across the lines, and then all of the things that were so lousy before start to work, they start listening to something about the other groups. Communication starts to be interesting about the other side. The leaders find that not only can they take steps to have contact with the other group, but they, partly sometimes because of a reluctance to yield a little power may sometimes feel themselves pushed by their membership to establish interaction across these lines. Similarly, contacts that don't involve this interdependence, then start being used for fruitful interdependence, for planning even new projects on their own and this was observed in our studies. Last time, in Syracuse, some questions came up. What sort of super-ordinate goals are there in order that people can get together, especially with their minds made up about each other? What sort of thing can you do when this sort of hardening of sides takes place? Then I referred back to this idea of attitudes and something that's not exactly fixed and set for life in the sense that there are many new problems that arise, especially in times of rapid change, in which minds are made up, and it is in this area of non-commitment frequently that interaction can start on a rather meaningful level among individuals and between groups that you never would have thought could communicate before.

Q/C: On the misconception, the assumption--the fourth one--you said the major concern of lower class youth is not money. I was wondering what were your findings about their major concern.

DR. SHERIF: Number one, all over the place at those ages, is to be a person and to have people recognize that and to be able to acquire things that are your own and not just handed down. This is all across the board and it's at the upper socioeconomic level, too. This is why we're seeing it today in some of the most prestigious universities in the country. Some of the most advantaged youths in our country are saying we want to have some independence and to be a person in the process. This was true in our research even at the high school level although its concrete expression could cover a wide range. Then among lower class youths and I here address myself especially to black youths and the Spanish-speaking, at this time of life, there's this very, very strong concern with definition of self, a feeling that they have been defined in a way and actually denied opportunities that even other youths aren't denied, so that makes it sort of a common interest kind of thing. Coming at this time of life it is strongly seen and felt and frequently is accompanied by daily experiences that make it abrasive. For instance, in San Antonio, Texas, these Spanish-speaking boys clearly, if they go downtown in a group, they get picked up by a pliceman. That was just what policemen do. Now I must say the black youths in San Antonio didn't have quite such a hard time that way because it wasn't at least thought to be suspicious for them to be out of their neighborhoods. But this business of being defined as a person to whom not only does age have a barrier for you but, by definition, is an overriding preoccupation of this age, they want to do something about it. Then, one of the things our early observers had said we used a combination of methods, but one of our methods to get data was to have the observers write reports down all the time; a running account of what went on. And when we'd talk to them and get them to enlarge on this to get a little better report, on one ocassion we said to one of the observers, "Don't these boys ever talk about girls?" He said, "Oh yeah, but I just took that naturally," so he hadn't put that down. Now girls and boys and their relations in sex are terribly important at this time, and this involves definition of self too in a sense because it isn't all just getting it. The whole interaction pattern among boys, for example, can't be understood without its relationship to sex. Girls are inclined not to boast, you know, very much. Boys boast, but this is all very important. Frankly in the informal things we didn't find too much interaction centered about the sorts of things that probably counselors would be worried about. We did have some of the young people that used drugs and we were regarded as very successful observers who would have the opportunity to observe these things directly. Unlike the stereotyped views of drug using, and in this marijuana was involved, we haven't had any LSD users. It was a thing that went on--two or three members at a time--the others might be drinking beer at the same time or something of the kind. It wasn't a normative activity as "you gotta do it" sort of thing, although it was proved that there wasn't force being used. These, it seemed to us, were kind of incidental to the youth activities.

Q/C: Did you find this concern more at the upper socioeconomic level and the lower as opposed to the comfortable, more comfortable middle class?

DR. SHERIF: No we didn't in our research, but there were big differences in this respect. The upper-class kids that we studied had access to alcohol at that time. It was already very much a part of their lives, and they could get in their own homes. In the lower class youth that we studied, the use of drugs was much more common. This might have changed by now. In any such case when it's illegal, like marijuana is now and so on, you will find that there are extra precautions taken regardless of socioeconomic class.

Q/C: I'm sorry--I broke in there probably at the wrong time. I was referring more to the concern, the different sets of values, the guy who's more in line, upper and lower, as opposed to concern for other people than concern for themselves. I was just wondering if the lower level of socioeconomic class are on their way out. They have problems; they're working to combat these problems, at least some of them are. The upper socioeconomic class, it seems to me, are concerned with other people now as well as with themselves and the question I'm asking is, are they more involved than the more comfortable middle class?

DR. SHERIF: We have no data to show that that would be true. The few upper class groups that we succeeded in studying was indeed a very difficult task. The few that we had were pretty self-content and involved very much with their own set. Now that doesn't mean that they were little angels because they certainly weren't. There was even one from our upper class groups who got involved in a "gang fight" that was centered around another girl and another one of them was involved in about $250 worth of damages in a motel where they had rented a couple of suites to have a party. So they weren't angels but they were quite self-absorbed with each other. We weren't studying in a college setting, you understand, and I wouldn't want to generalize, but I would have no eveidence that your question is true.

Q/C: I wasn't sure that I understood a statement that you made. Did you say that it is more difficult for youths to become adults in our present-day society?

DR. SHERIF: Yes, I think I did say that. It's related to problems that I really don't know too much about as a social psychologist. I know it's related to the job market, and economic questions and all these kinds of things, but not only are we prolonging the period for larger numbers of our youths to the time when they can say, "We are adults," but I think that adults today are less clear on what that means than 50 years ago. Fifty years ago, to be adults meant having some kind of a way of earning your living, establishing a family, and, in general, behaving as a mature person. Now I think that it might be helpful for young people to realize, and I think it's true, that today adults are more confused, of what it means to be "mature," what it means to be an adult in this society. So I think that that is still true now.

Q/C: I was wondering if you thought that that might be a reaction to young people getting out in the world earlier in their lives nowadays than they used to.

DR. SHERIF: I doubt that they are getting out in the world earlier now. We must understand that for large proportions of lower class youths, the age of maturity used to be pretty well settled by the necessity of taking a job in order to help support his family, and so on. I think the lower class youths also are having a more prolonged period in which, even if they go into the army, which many do, they don't get to feel fully grownup. This is reflected in employment figures in many inner cities. Philadelphia is a good example, where you have large numbers of young people dropping out of school but this applies more to boys. The girls typically get married and then they are adults. You see, fifty years ago they just starved to death, but they're not starving today. What I'm saying is that they had to grow up faster. They had to be adults faster fifty years ago than they do today, but I may be wrong.

I think the young people today are really the greatest hope of this country. I think this country has some bad problems and I think that the young people, while they're saying, "Well we're all right, we're redefining ourselves, Okay? Now how about let's redefine this world that we're living in?" I think that this is going to have to be done before you know....